

THE CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

No. XXXI.—JULY, 1881.

THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL AND THE NEW TESTAMENT.

IN *The Catholic Presbyterian* of June, 1880, the present writer attempted some brief account of the teaching of the Old Testament regarding the immortality of the soul. It is his purpose in this paper to refer, with equal brevity, to the evidence furnished by the New Testament for this great doctrine.

If in the New Testament, as in the Old, we find the doctrine of man's natural immortality more frequently ~~implied~~ than stated directly, we must not on this account regard its evidence as the less complete. It is but little the manner of Scripture, in either Testament, to state as independent propositions the primary moral and religious truths, such as the personal existence of God, His government of the world, the moral agency of man, his immortality. Though sometimes declared with solemn emphasis, such great primary truths are generally assumed; and they blend with the instructions, admonitions, warnings, and promises of Scripture, lending momentous importance to all that is said. We need not deny the presence of the underlying rock because it does not everywhere come to the surface. Nor, again, should it be matter of surprise if we shall find that far more is said regarding the existence of the righteous than the existence of the wicked in the future state. The future of the wicked—the unsaved—is not represented except for purposes of warning, and for the vindication of God's justice, holiness, and power.

1. The New Testament agrees with the Old in clearly distinguishing between the body and the soul of man. The soul or spirit is not represented as a function of the body, or as a modification of matter, but as a distinct subsistence, with its own properties and interests. The advocates of Trichotomy find in the New Testament several passages which, with good show of probability, are cited in favour of that doctrine, but there is certainly little to be adduced in support of Homogeneity. Man in his personality is doubtless *one*. To speak of plurality in his conscious-

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

ness were an absurdity; but the distinction between the material and the spiritual in him—the mortal and the immortal—is not the less real.

"Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. x. 28). The instruments of the persecutor cannot touch the soul; the prison cannot confine it, the rack cannot torture it, the sword cannot pierce it; God only can lay His hand upon it.

When we are "absent from the body" we shall be "present with the Lord" (2 Cor. v. 8). There is, therefore, a higher part in us which carries the *ego* with it, and which has conscious existence when separated from the body.

The apostle cannot tell whether he was "in the body" or "out of the body," when he was "caught up to the third heaven—into paradise" (2 Cor. xii. 2-4). If the soul cannot subsist apart from the body, surely the decision between these alternatives was easy. If, as the advocates of conditional immortality maintain, the dissolution of the body terminates consciousness till the resurrection, the apostle might tell whether or not he was "in the body." If he held Materialism in any form, why should he hesitate? The distinction between soul and body might securely rest upon this passage alone.

But, in like manner, believing in the duality of man's nature, the apostle Peter speaks of "~~putting off this his tabernacle~~" (2 Peter i. 14); language which ~~cannot be harmonised with the view which we are~~ opposing.

In vision, the Apostle ~~John saw under the altar~~ "the souls of them that were slain for the Word of God; and the testimony which they held" (Rev. vi. 9). He saw also ~~the souls of them that were beheaded~~ for the witness of Jesus and for the Word of God (Rev. xx. 4). Assume the identity of soul and body, or assume that the soul is a function of the body, and that it cannot be conscious or act apart from the body, and how then shall we interpret these and similar parts of the Bible?

2. In proceeding to quote a few passages of Scripture which speak of a general resurrection and judgment, and of awards stretching into eternity, I would premise two observations. *First*, that owing to the abundance and variety of the passages which might be adduced, it is not possible in a few paragraphs to present this part of the argument in a way that shall give an adequate impression of its strength. *Second*, that the passages to be cited must be read with remembrance of what Scripture everywhere teaches respecting the great evil of sin, as arising from the absolute holiness of God and the claims of His law, and from the degradation therein implied of the high nature with which God has endowed us.

(1.) The New Testament, then, makes known the fact of a general resurrection and judgment. In the sixth chapter of John, the Lord declares that everlasting life comes through faith in Him, and that dead

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

souls shall hear His voice and live. He has life in Himself, even as the Father has, and has received authority to execute judgment. Nor let this be thought incredible, "for the hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." A general resurrection and judgment is no deduction from this passage, but is the very thing affirmed. Any interpretation which would give a spiritual or allegorical sense to these words is clearly not allowable. Marvel not, says the Lord, at the spiritual quickening of which I tell you, for a literal quickening will take place by my power.

Paul, in his defence of himself before Felix, said that he had the same hope towards God that his Jewish accusers allowed, "that there should be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust" (Acts xxiv. 15). Not only is this part of his belief, but it is a part so little questioned by his opponents (not questioned at all, indeed, except by the Sadducees) that he offers no vindication of it, but refers to it rather as a momentous truth about which there was no dispute among Jews who believe all things "written in the Law and in the Prophets."

Nor did the apostle conceal the same truth when preaching to the subtle-minded and sceptical Athenians on Mars' Hill; for he proclaimed that "God had appointed a day in which He would judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom He had ordained, whereof He had given assurance unto all men in that He had raised Him from the dead" (Acts xvii. 31).

In 2 Cor. v. 10 it is said: "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." This appearing is, of course, after death; for we are to receive recompense for the things done in the body, *i.e.*, in the present life.

(2.) We next adduce a few passages in which the punishment of the wicked is referred to, either as pursuant on the judgment, or without special reference to judgment as preceding.

In Matt. viii. 11, 12 it is said, "Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." And when the lord of the evil servant who is drunken and beats his fellow-servants comes, he will "cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. xxiv. 51). After the Lord comes, and reckons with His servants to whom He has entrusted the talents, the "unprofitable servant shall be cast into outer darkness, where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. xxv. 30). In Matt. xxv. 30-46 the final judgment is so portrayed, in its universality, in the principles on which it proceeds, and in its issues, that no misdirected criticism can ever quite efface the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

impression which the scene there depicted makes upon the human mind. The Son of Man comes in His glory, and all nations are gathered before Him. He separates them like sheep from the goats. He applies unerringly to them the test of character and state. The wicked go away into everlasting punishment, and the righteous into everlasting life. No annihilation here. Time is ended, and the great cycle of eternity is entered on. Character and destiny have the stamp of unchangeableness set upon them.

The existence and punishment of the wicked after death is taught in the story of Lazarus and the rich man (Luke xvi.). The wealthy sensualist dies and is buried. But this is not the end. In Hades he lifts up his eyes, being in torments, and finds that his evil life has brought upon him misery from which there is no escape. It is useless to tell us that this is a parable, not a real case, and that no doctrinal deduction must be made from it. A parable differs from a fable in presenting a situation which is possible to be realised; and though we should call this story a *parable*, it must teach us something. What is that something, unless it be a solemn warning of a dismal future to those who trust in riches, and pamper the body while they starve the soul? It is unnecessary to consider the view of those who regard the punishment here signified as limited to the intermediate state, or as purgatorial in nature; for, in any case, the distinction of soul and body, and the continued existence of the soul after death, are clearly marked. The representation is consistent neither with the opinion of those advocates of conditional immortality who think that the unsaved shall not exist at all after death, nor with the opinion (more prevalent perhaps), that the being of the unredeemed shall be restored at the resurrection, so that they may be judged, and finally die out in the second death.

Let me now set down these very awful passages from the Book of Revelation:—"If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever" (chap. xiv. 9-11). "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened, and another book was opened which is the book of life, and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell (Hades) gave up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire" (chap. xx. 12-15). This is the termination of the reign of death and Hades, consequently it is after the present life is ended.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

My last quotation under this second head is Mark ix. 43-48 :—
 “And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” The meaning is, that how painful soever it may be to break with our sins—to deny ourselves ungodliness and worldly lusts—it is better to make the sacrifice than to incur endless sorrow. For it looks like trifling to say that though the fire is not quenched, nor does the worm die, yet their operation upon any who are subjected to them may be but temporary, even momentary; for these may be either released after purification, or annihilated. Were this the meaning, why should a threefold repetition lend such awful emphasis to the fact that the worm never dies and the fire is never quenched? Surely there is more here than the necessary and eternal opposition of the Divine holiness to sin, the fact that sin can never be committed with impunity.

3. We may place under a separate head those passages of Scripture which represent the future punishment of the wicked as in exact proportion to their guilt: these are inconsistent with the notion that the wicked become non-existent at death. The following are specimens of this class :—“As many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ” (Rom. ii. 12, 16). “And that servant which knew his lord’s will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes” (Luke xii. 47, 48). “Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works which were done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell; for if the mighty works which have been done in thee had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee” (Matt. xi. 21-23). Such passages would not be quoted against that modification of the annihilation theory which teaches that the unsaved shall cease to exist after, in some cases, a long period, it may be, of punishment; but they are clearly irreconcilable with the doctrine that no unregenerate person

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

can survive the death of the body. For how, in this case, are the awards of punishment to correspond with the guilt? Is it open to say that the punishment is to be inflicted *before* death? Tyre and Sidon, Sodom and Gomorrah, are yet to be judged: "it *shall* be more tolerable in the day," &c. Or, if it should be said that the difference in the punishment will be found in the article of death itself, then we ask, do not many wicked men die without any pain, or a moment's preliminary agony of conscience?

So far as our examination of Scripture has gone, there is nothing to favour the opinion that any human soul shall cease to exist. The account of man's origin (spoken of in previous papers), if it does not expressly declare his endless existence, prepares us to expect it; and we have found many texts distinctly stating or clearly implying the survival of physical death both by the righteous and the wicked, and their entrance upon a state of being which is declared to be unending. Nor are we told of anything which makes it probable that an existence which has not been terminated by death will come to an end after that great crisis has been passed. The survival of death, unless the opposite were distinctly declared, would imply the strong probability of the eternal survival of it. This ground might very properly be taken, even were there no passages which speak of the state beyond death as everlasting. Hence we must regard those advocates of conditional immortality who, in accordance with their doctrine as to the nature of man—in accordance with their materialism—believe that the unregenerate shall have no future at all, as much more consistent than their brethren who, in order to escape obvious collision with much of Scripture, allow that the wicked shall be raised up for judgment, and shall then, after a period longer or shorter, cease to exist.

What is there, then, in the Scriptures to give any plausibility to the doctrine of the Annihilation of the Wicked? So far as the advocates of this doctrine make appeal to the Word of God, it is chiefly to two classes of passages: those in which man is said to have a soul (*nephesh*, *psyche*) in common with the brutes, and those in which the penalty of sin and the doom of the sinner are represented by such terms as "death," "destruction," "perdition," "corruption;" or those in which the wicked are said to be "consumed," "doomed," "burned up," "blotted out," "ground to powder," &c.; or those passages, again, in which "life," "eternal life," is said to come only through Jesus Christ. Says a writer of this school:—"Are life and death to be taken in a metaphorical sense whenever they look beyond the veil that divides time from eternity, or do they retain their common meaning?" And another says he "is embarrassed by the fact that he should be asked to prove that when a man is dead, he is dead, and not alive."

The argument founded on the "*psyche*," which is common to man and the animals, was dealt with in the first paper. To many of our readers it will probably seem strange that a meaning different from the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

literal and ordinary one should be refused to such terms as "death," when used of the doom of the wicked. Is it not clear that, if our doctrine were true, no other terms need be employed in declaring it than those which are actually employed? How can we represent the things of the higher sphere, the future existence, except by expressions borrowed from the things of this? Even as to things here, our language to represent the supersensuous is borrowed from the senses. This is universally admitted, and requires no proof. When, therefore, you speak of things which eye hath not seen nor ear heard, we must employ the terms which, by analogy, are best suited to awaken the right conception. We cannot yet speak the tongue which may be proper to the unseen, eternal state. Instances, more than sufficient to show that the narrow view of terms now referred to will not suffice in the interpretation of Scripture, can easily be adduced. Take, *e.g.*, the word "death," so often employed in speaking of the wicked. "He that loveth not his brother abideth in death." "To be carnally minded is death." "The sorrow of the world worketh death." "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" "The emotions of sin did bring forth fruit unto death." "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth." "If a man abide in my sayings he shall never see death." The Old Testament uses the term in the same way. "All that hate me love death." "In the pathway thereof is no death." "I have set before you this day life and good, death and evil." It is unnecessary further to multiply passages to show that there is frequently an ethical and spiritual meaning in "death," and that it often expresses the whole penalty of sin. In like manner, "life" represents the blessedness to which the righteous attain. They begin to enjoy it here. They enter upon the full possession of it when they are present with the Lord. "Whoso findeth me, wisdom, findeth life." "In His favour is life." "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." "To be spiritually minded is life and peace." "If we *live* in the Spirit, let us walk in the Spirit." Believers are "dead, indeed, unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Thus, inasmuch as life represents what is dearest to us, and death what is most dreaded by us, these terms are employed to denote the joys and the sorrows of the world to come. "Should any one," says Moses Stuart, "range the whole compass of human language, he could find no two terms so significant as these, in order to designate the joys of heaven and the pains of hell."

In the same way must we explain the terms when the wicked are said to be "destroyed," to "perish," &c. There is no necessity for these expressions meaning annihilation, or ceasing to be. *Apollumi* means to destroy utterly, to perish, to be undone. As applied to the sinner, it means that he is undone, utterly ruined. "The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost"—had perished (Luke xix. 10). "This thy brother was dead and is alive again, and was lost" (had

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

perished—was destroyed) “and is found” (Luke xv. 32). So the Lord says, “Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear Him which is able to *destroy* both soul and body in hell” (gehenna). The contrast is not, as the annihilationist would have it, between man’s killing only the body, and God’s killing the soul as well; it is that man can kill the body, but God can *destroy* both soul and body. He can blight both, ruin both, in hell.

So in 2 Thess. i. 9 we read that those who know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, shall be punished with everlasting destruction (*olethron aiōnion*); i.e., destruction which is *aiōnion* in its character and continuance. I am not here discussing the punishment of the wicked except in its bearing upon the question of their continued existence—their immortality; but it were easy to show that the language employed in representing their punishment is very often figurative, and is to be explained in accordance with this fact. The kingdom of heaven, e.g., is likened to a field in which wheat and tares grow together until the harvest: the wheat is gathered into the barn, and the tares are thrown into the fire. How absurd it would be to ignore the form of presentation here, and to infer that the wicked shall literally be burnt up! The Lord Himself obviates any such misconception; for, in explaining this parable, He says that in the furnace into which they shall be cast, there “shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.”

So when the parable of the marriage-feast is given—the feast held at night in the well-lighted and sumptuous palace—the guests who have not the wedding-garment are bound hand and foot, and cast out into the “darkness” and the cold. And when the condition of the lost is represented under allusion to Gehenna, or the Valley of the Son of Hinnom, it is said, “Their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched.” I must again, therefore, assert that while all language employed in setting forth this awful topic must needs be such as our present experience gives meaning to, it were altogether unwarranted to fix upon certain words, such as “death,” or “destruction,” and insist upon giving them a strictly literal or materialistic meaning. The true expositor cannot fall into such a mistake.

It has, I think, been shown in these papers—(a.) That according to Scripture the soul or spirit of man is something distinct from the body; (b.) That the soul, after leaving the body at death, retains a conscious existence; (c.) That there shall be a general resurrection of the dead; (d.) That all men, good and bad, shall, after the present life is ended, stand before God in judgment, when their final doom shall be pronounced; (e.) That even as the righteous enter the heavenly blessedness, so the wicked are consigned to a place in which they shall experience the awful consequences of sin; (f.) That such terms as “death,” “destruction,” “perdition,” applied to represent the fate of the wicked, do not, when understood as Scripture itself teaches us to understand them, contain any reference to annihilation or the extinction of

CATH
being
and
depe
shall
man
being
the

IN
Syn
wor
des
Chr
was
fiel
tion
of
est
wit
Gro
Re
res

bis
be
ab
rel
bis
mi
th
re
of
ne
th
wi

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

being ; (g.) That whilst God alone has immortality (incorruptibility), and whilst the continued existence of all souls, and of all creatures, depends upon His will, we have no reason to think that any human soul shall be annihilated ; but rather, by the plain and natural meaning of many passages of Scripture, we are taught to believe that all human beings, the righteous and the wicked, the renewed and the unrenewed, the saved and the lost, shall continue to exist for ever and ever.

WILLIAM CAVEN.

RECENT EVANGELICAL MOVEMENTS IN RUSSIA.

By Pastor DALTON, of the Reformed Church, St. Petersburg.

[TRANSLATED.]

IN March, 1880, the Archimandrite Nicolai, on his return from many years of missionary activity in Japan, delivered a speech before the Synod of the Greek Orthodox Church which excited no small degree of wonder in Evangelical circles in Russia, and even beyond. He was deservedly welcomed home as one who had shown that the Russian Church could carry on a successful mission by legitimate means. He was received with Slavic generosity, and was able to return to the foreign field with more than a hundred thousand roubles for the various operations of the Mission ; and in addition he was invested with the dignity of a bishop. A new see was not requisite. Years ago, there had been established a bishopric of Revel, in Finland, but the office had remained without any occupant. In these Lutheran regions the members of the Greek Orthodox Church are but few ; and, therefore, the holder of the Revel Russian bishopric might, without inconvenience, take up his residence in the capital of Japan.

It is, however, a custom in the Russian Church that a newly-appointed bishop should, after solemn investiture, deliver an inaugural address before the assembled Synod. The missionary, who had been long years absent from European Russia, and was unacquainted with the state of religion in it, must have cast a somewhat cursory glance upon his bishopric *in partibus infidelium*, and hastily imagined how things might or should be, before he brought himself to utter, as a missionary, the words of his inaugural discourse. To his nominal flock at Revel, residing in the midst of an exclusively Protestant population, the majority of which flock, moreover, cannot have forgotten the curious facts connected with their own conversion to the Greco-Russian Church about thirty years ago,—to this flock, which he was to leave so soon in the wilderness, the newly-elected bishop opened up, in his speech, the neces-

10 RECENT EVANGELICAL MOVEMENTS IN RUSSIA.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

sity of missions, not only to the heathen, but to Roman Catholics and Protestants besides.

It was not at all possible, said the good bishop, to be a consistent Catholic or Protestant. Roman Catholicism and Protestantism are in their very nature a mish-mash of revealed truths and human inventions, which cannot be mixed up any more than the iron and the miry clay. They are in fundamental opposition, according to even the rudimentary principles of logic ; and they must, therefore, by logical consequence, either lead to Greek orthodoxy the few who have the good fortune to apprehend it, or, on the other hand conduct the less-highly favoured, who go off on the side of human invention, to new and heretical doctrine, or worse still, to the depths of non-Christianity and Atheism. He went on to say that it was the duty of Greek orthodoxy to contend against these evil tendencies, and not to leave them, as had hitherto been done, almost entirely disregarded. For, said he, if we continue thus indifferent, the infection which has corrupted both Catholicism and Protestantism will also communicate itself to us. The present faithlessness over which so many mourn is but a natural product of the unhealthy issues from the corruptions of the massive body of Catholicism, and the loosely-connected and scarcely living members of Protestantism. But where will the philosophico-analytical spirit fasten on orthodoxy, and what will it find in her either unreasonable or false? Everything in her is inimitable, rational, and holy ; for she is like a resplendent globe,—ideally complete, entirely apart, and strong beyond the possibility of suffering from a wound ! But, he continued, we have need of quickening labour, which, like a refreshing, enlivening breeze, shall not only have effect with us, but in the West also,—a labour directed against the causes of unbelief, against the corruptions of Divine truth, both in Popery and Protestantism. We labour zealously to cut off the heads of the Hydra, and in this work, both Catholics and Protestants aid us ; we possess not a few excellent (for the most part translated) works against unbelief, in reference to the latest forms of apologetic. But effective writings against Popery and Protestantism we have none. And unbelief continues to grow in Western Europe as well as amongst ourselves, and will continue to grow until we bestir ourselves to pluck up the root from which it springs. But this is impossible, if we do not send men from our midst, if we do not form a society whose special work shall be the controversy with Protestantism and Popery, both orally and with the pen,—a controversy of course which excludes other means than those compatible with Christian love, but which should nevertheless be burning as Christian love itself, for the controversy should be waged for the sake of love. May God grant that this may soon come to pass !

Enough, however, of this deeply painful and incomprehensible speech, to which in Russia we have no parallel. The words are all the more painful because they come from the mouth of a man who did not need

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

to utter them in order to attract attention to himself. Just at the very time when the bishop was uttering this hostile speech, we were rejoicing in the picture which the Rev. Dr. Fleming Stevenson had drawn of his missionary activity in Japan. The vapour of the bishop's harsh speech will not, however, obliterate the clear impression made by the missionary. "The chief of the Russian Mission in Tôkiyô," says the Rev. Dr. Stevenson, "is a man of singular earnestness; his appearance is extremely attractive; his countenance full of dignity, feeling, and love.

"The chief service was held in the simply-adorned chapel in his own house; the liturgy was read from a manuscript translation* he himself had prepared. We found his small chapel crowded. The good man lives the whole day in continuous labour. Many speak of his services with high praise. He has assistants in various parts of the city. His official position in the Russian embassy gives him influence over a number of persons belonging to the highest circles in Japan. After Divine service, the most of the audience left; a few remained to partake of the Lord's supper. When this was over, a large tray with rice was brought in, on the top of which a broad cross had been formed by tea leaves. After going through a short special liturgy, those present partook of the rice, which they formed with their fingers into small pellets."

It is not our purpose to controvert the unhappy speech of the good bishop, which we have just given in outline; ours is a higher aim. That inaugural address has invited attention to the inner life of the Russian Church. It is true we are not accustomed to many indications of life in our venerable sister the Greek Orthodox Church. Those farthest off see neither breath nor motion. As everything beneath and above slumbers, so, from the times of Athanasius and Damascenus, the Church appears like a procession of monks passing along the shores of an enchanted lake, while condemned to the strictest rule of silence. Hence, whatever movement may take place in the depths of the inner life of the Greek Church, its outward expression is suppressed, and leaves no trace behind. Still, the observing eye, which looks more closely, does detect, on the apparently quiet surface, some evangelical tendencies.

As the somewhat strong language of the good bishop has drawn our attention to the movements of the Church to which he belongs, we propose to give a rapid delineation of these. And, as the seeds out of which the present has grown, we may be permitted to cast a brief glance at some things which are past, but which have left their impression on the life of the present.

Of two such movements we would speak—that of the Stundists in the interior of Russia, and that connected with the name of Pashkoff, the scene of whose activity was the metropolis of the empire. Besides

* The missionary is highly gifted with linguistic power: for years the New Testament in Japanese has lain translated in his desk. May it soon see the light!

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

these, there rise up before the mind's eye the attractive forms of the Molokaus, and the Society for the enlightenment of the clergy—the head of the latter association being a Grand Duke. It is necessary, however, to occupy a more limited ground. The Molokaus have, within the last few years, deservedly attracted much attention. We need only refer to the essays of Pecht which appeared two years ago; these, however, are only extracts from the thoroughgoing and comprehensive studies of Kostomaroff. We may also mention Mackenzie Wallace's interesting chapter "Among the Heretics," though his notices, vigorously and carefully as they are drawn, do not give a full account of this remarkable sect; many characteristics may and ought to be added in order to give a complete picture, supplied by persons who, themselves knowing the Gospel, have been witnesses of the true character of this religious body.

With regard to the society mentioned, nothing has reached the public for nearly a couple of years, perhaps because they have not succeeded in awakening the sympathy of the Church and the community, or because they have overlooked the work lying at hand, and have gone over into premature action at a distance.

We will now, however, say something of the Stundists.

The earliest account of the Stundists reached the public through the *Odessa Gazette* of the 14th March, 1868. There had been some vague reports of a religious movement originating in the lonely village of the steppe belonging to a German colony. The pastor of the place, Charles Bonekemper, whose name had been repeated many times in connection with the work, deemed it his duty to publish, in the above-named Russian paper, which is widely circulated in the coast towns of the Black Sea, some account of the so-called Stundists. The article was signed by the pastor, who described himself as belonging to the Reformed Church in Rohrbach, a place whose name was an agreeable sound to the colonists of the South. The father of the pastor, John Bonekemper, who came originally from the Wupperthal, belonged to a small body of missionaries who had been sent out in 1823 to the Caucasus by the mission house at Basle, as pioneers in succession to the Scottish Mission to the same region, but who, on their work being prohibited, remained for the most part in Russia as pastors to the numerous German colonies of the South. It was as early as 1824 that our Bonekemper came to Rohrbach, a German colony established in the midst of the fruitful steppe about sixty kilometres from Odessa, where he carried on his pastoral labours for a quarter of a century with great and blessed success. His parishioners, who had sprung mostly from the Palatinate and Würtemberg, whence they had emigrated about 1809, had kept up the old Würtemberg practice of holding meetings, or "*Stunden*," for the reading and study of the Scriptures, and he diligently encouraged the practice. During a short stay in the colony about twenty years ago, I remarked how fresh the memory of the elder Bonekemper was in the remembrance of his people, and could see with my own eyes the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

beneficial influence arising from the observance of such meetings. After preaching three times in the various district churches of the colony, I was invited in the evening to take part in the Stundists' gathering. Men and women were assembled in the schoolroom, when a chorale was sung with powerful voices without the aid of an instrument. Next, a venerable peasant opened the meeting with a prayer which came from the depths of a devout heart; then there was read a portion of Scripture, on whose contents a man, well-versed in the Word, spoke for half-an-hour. The service was an excellent school for young preachers; for the speech of the devout peasant reflected what he had heard in the three preceding services, and showed how he understood what had been said. What to the preacher had seemed a thought of a specially deep and remarkable character, had, to his shame, disappeared without leaving a trace behind: it had quite gone over the head of his hearers! But the devout thoughts which had seemed to him of less moment, had been carefully retained in the pious heart of the peasant, and were again set forth in plain language in the ears of the people. After prayer and praise the meeting was dismissed.

But the influence of the *Stundenhalter* did not cease here. Those who had been associated with one another for the reading and study of the Word of God, also remained near to each other in a life and walk according to the precepts of that Word, and watched over each other's souls. Church discipline was strictly exercised, so that whoever lived disorderly or wantonly was excluded from the brotherhood,—a severe punishment in a lonely colony, where such an exclusion was felt in all the relations of life. But such a brotherhood has its temptations and dangers. Narrow-mindedness, hypocrisy, and spiritual pride may easily insinuate themselves, and then the position of the pastor becomes a difficult one. When, however, he succeeds, through Christian wisdom, in checking such tendencies; when he succeeds, through friendly and prudent concert with the best members of his flock, in keeping the management of the church, not as the lord over their faith but the partaker of their joy, then he gains a powerful support for his responsible labours.

For scores of years the "*Stundenhalter*" have exercised their quiet influence solely over their co-religionists. As the life of these colonists, on their world-forgotten steppe, remained totally without effect, as to worldly matters, on the people in whose territory they had found a home, so was it up to a very recent period in religious matters. It was as if the people, so near to one another, locally, belonged to different worlds; and as if their religious life were separated by an impassable gulf, which there was no disposition on either side to bridge over. All this was altered in 1869, when the son of Bonekemper, after many wanderings, returned from America to the home of his youth, and was chosen as their pastor by the colonists of Rohrbach, out of grateful remembrance of his father. The young preacher, marked by a power of

14 *RECENT EVANGELICAL MOVEMENTS IN RUSSIA.*

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

rapid assimilation, had gone through a course of theological training in America, but was master of the Russian language and could thus make himself acquainted with the natives of the country through the medium of their own tongue. He had thus the opportunity, of which he sometimes availed himself, of entering into conversation with his Russian neighbours on religious topics. He came into contact, amongst others, with a devout, earnest peasant from the Government of Kieff, who had migrated south in search of work. The peasant was present at family worship in the pastor's house, and also at the Stundists' meetings. The pastor kindly interpreted to the earnest and curious peasant the purport of these meetings, which by-and-by awakened his lively interest. Through the quick, appropriative power of his countrymen, he learned to read in a short time; the Emperor Alexander II., now of lamented memory, had permitted a free circulation of the Scriptures, as an appropriate sequel to his abolition of serfdom, and now our pious peasant received a copy of the precious volume as a present. With deep earnestness he entered heartily into the contents of the sacred volume, and experienced its powerful and holy effects in his own soul. He had now found the key to what he had witnessed in the meetings; and what was more, he felt that inward peace which belongs to a soul who knows the Saviour and has experience of His love.

It was thus as a new creature that the peasant returned at last to his home. He brought with him, to his native village in the province of Kieff, the pearl of great price he had found. What he had found he would not hide from his neighbours. The peasants assembled around him in the poor cabin during the long winter evenings, while he exercised his new power of reading the Scriptures. The sooty, close cabin became a temple of the living God; the hearers were moved by the sacred Word which exercised its soul-transforming power. Of dissenting from the Church they had not the remotest idea; no true Russian, indeed, thinks lightly of such a thing. But with faithful hearts they came to their priest, asking him to aid them in some of their difficulties in understanding certain passages of the Word of God. Such a demand, however, had not been made for many years upon the poor, old, and not highly-gifted pastor; the very notion of such a thing was foreign to him, and besides, the matter was not easy in itself! The wished-for explanation was not forthcoming; and, curtly and abruptly repelled, they returned to their cabin to seek from God the explanation which they could not obtain from their spiritual guide.

The religious movement was not confined to that one village, whose name we forbear to mention. Here and there amongst the surrounding villages spread the news of these Bible-readers. The seed ever struck its roots deeper into pious and inquiring hearts. Neither the march of time, which sets bounds to all human movements and interests, nor even the oppression and persecution which have been exercised upon not a few of the persons participating in the movement, have been able to

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

check its progress ; and the Bible-readers, in the Kieff and other Governments, whither the wave of the movement has reached, are, up to the present, reckoned by many thousands, while there are no indications as yet of slackening.

We are indebted for the following notices to a member of the Greek Orthodox Church, who figured later in a certain narrative as Count Bibleman. Animated by a pure love to his Church and the truth, as well as by the wish to become conversant with the power of the movement on the spot, and equipped with the necessary documents from the highest authorities in Church and State, this nobleman visited these remote villages two years ago, and made himself acquainted with the leaders of the movement. From this unquestionable source, we give the following account of these Evangelical Christians.

As soon as the Stundists came, by careful reading of the Word of God, to an understanding of the Gospel, they were troubled in mind because they had remained so long in ignorance, and some even cast reflections on the Church for having kept them in this state. At first, after the movement began, they diligently attended service in the Church, but when the priests raised opposition, and even took from some of them their much-loved New Testaments, they ceased, though with heavy hearts, to attend the Church services, and confined themselves to their private meetings, believing that in the diligent study of the Word of God, they got more blessing for their souls than by participation in a service which, being conducted in the Slavonic language, they only partly understood. They received no one into their community who could not speak of a change of heart, and whose life and conversation were not in accordance with the Gospel. As might have been expected, the evils likely to arise from the absence of trained leaders have not failed to show themselves. Baptist tendencies have appeared, some zealous adherents of these views having come among them before the Evangelical Church had even heard of their existence.

In their services, free prayer occupies a prominent place : they are careful to pray for the Emperor, and thank God that through his favour the Word of God in their own language has been put into their hands, and has obtained so wide a circulation. In answer to the question whether they understand the Word of God, they reply, " When we read the Bible we are but as little chickens, which try to pierce the shell."

Like the Stundists in the German Colonies, they exercise a strict moral discipline in their communities. Even their most determined opponents must admit the wonderful difference between their past and their present life. The use of intoxicating drinks has ceased amongst them : no oath or curse is heard from their lips. The effect of diligence and activity in their duties is soon seen in their improved condition, even as regards the things of this life. Two cases may be mentioned to illustrate their strict conscientiousness. A young woman belonging to the

(CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.)

sect spoke out against the lazy, careless labourers on the large estate of a Pole, and told them that such slovenly work was no better than theft. A night watchman resigned his situation and the most of his earnings, explaining that he could not, in conscience, sleep on his watch like the other watchmen; and that his hard work during the day prevented him from sufficient wakefulness during the night.

It is remarkable, and yet easy to understand that where the village priest proceeds against these people in a less bitter and harsh fashion, the Stundists do not grow so rapidly. They are most numerous in villages where the priest has opposed them most bitterly, and called the magistrate to his assistance. In one place where the clergyman was a Romish priest who had gone over to the Greek Church, the increase was the greatest. The convert had brought with him that persecuting zeal which is more common among the Roman than the Greek clergy. Sad stories were told of this man in the assemblies of those he persecuted. One saying attributed to him had awakened special indignation among the persecuted—namely, "That it did not matter how they lived who kept by the Church." This did not at all agree with what the Stundists had found in the Scriptures. They were perplexed also when their persecutors searched in their houses for the tract of the late venerable metropolitan of Moscow, entitled the "Way of Salvation;" for even his writings were not held to be fully orthodox.

It is only what might be expected that these plain people sometimes express, in a decided way, their discontentment with the morals and manners of the Orthodox Church of the country; the more so because these matters are clear to them from their acquaintance with the Word of God. But Russia is not the land of free speech, and such utterances render those who make use of them liable to a heavy punishment. Two Stundists were sent to a monastery for using such language, in order that, under the care of the monks, they might learn to be more cautious in their speech, and more churchly in their religion. Our informant saw them after they had been immured for six months. The poor men, accustomed to heavy and continuous labour in the fields, had now been condemned to pass their time in idleness; but not a monk had spoken to them out of the Bible, or about Church or faith; and their souls, accustomed to other nourishment, were dry for lack of the water of life.

In another case, an approved *gendarme* was appointed to be present at certain Stundist meetings. The soldier soon began to feel the influence of the Word of God, as heard in the discourses and conversation of the people he was set to watch. He accordingly began to read the Scriptures for himself, with the inevitable result that the power of its contents and the influence of its spirit ever grew upon him. The effect was soon visible. He drank no more *vodka*—the corn brandy of the country; no more evil words were heard to come from his lips; his life and fulfilment of duty became blameless. But he could not

CAT
rest
part
prac
blas
pris
in th
com
of i
the
thre
if h
coul
and
such
him
sent
T
as is
som
from
peac
the
God
—th
time
clear
to th
Gosp
gran
A
danc
danc
Joh
long
but
won
after
four
was
she
with
S
of F
the
we
circ
v

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

restrain his tongue in speaking of blots in the State Church. He became particularly bitter against the worship of sacred pictures, which is practised in that Church. In consequence, he was soon arrested for blasphemy. Our friend, who saw him after he had spent six months in prison for the free utterance of his opinions, heard the sound of a hymn in the distance, before he reached the cell. There was not a word of complaint as to his sufferings; no bitter speeches over his long months of imprisonment, but heartfelt joy for the ability to speak once more of the Word of God, and for the blessing of brotherly communion. The threatening prospect of banishment to Siberia seemed no hard matter, if his New Testament might only accompany him. Everywhere he could tell of that dear Saviour he had found, who had made him happy and patient in the midst of affliction. But it was dangerous to banish such a storm-proof nature as this, when the intention was to prevent him from becoming the first seed-corn in the land to which he would be sent, and from introducing the living truth where it had not yet come.

This evangelical movement is now more than ten years old. So far as is known, no excesses have taken place amongst these people, though some bitter speeches may have latterly been uttered against the Church from which they have had so much to suffer. They live quietly and peacefully in their villages; the deep and warm feeling of devotion of the peasant has found oil for its nourishment in the opened Book of God. Sometimes—perhaps through defect of experienced guidance—they interpret the Word more literally than they should, and sometimes even erroneously; yet in such cases, it is for the most part clearly and strikingly seen that the Word of God is an instructor even to the most ignorant, when they truly and earnestly seek Jesus in the Gospel. Let but a few cases, out of many, show how understanding is granted them, according to the promise.

A young woman, a Stundist, was asked whether she took part in the dance. "How can I dance," she replied, "when I remember that dancing seduced the heart of Herod, and rendered him willing to cut off John the Baptist's head?" Another young woman said she could no longer kiss the cross in the Church, for the cross had not redeemed her, but the precious blood of Jesus which was shed on the cross! A woman who worked as a day labourer on a distant and lonely estate, after she had long visited the meetings, joined the Lord's people, and found peace in the holy fellowship of believers. On one occasion she was observed to weep bitterly; and when asked why she wept, she said she could not refrain when she thought of the countless souls who were without this peace, and who, being without God, must perish.

Such are a few passing sketches of this great movement in the south of Russia, which has been much misrepresented. We shall next speak of the other in the north, which presents a remarkable contrast to the one we have now described, in that it has found a place amongst the highest circles of the metropolis.

LIBERAL EPISCOPALIANS—ARCHBISHOP
USHER.

A VERY high authority has said that "the memory of the just is blessed;"* which being interpreted, in connection with the clause that follows it, must mean that the memory of worthy men of former times continues the blissful influence of their lives to succeeding generations. So long as we possess the record of their lives, though dead they still commune with us; and coming through the softening influence of time, their words of warning or encouragement fall upon the heart as dew at summer eve refreshes tree or flower when the glare and heat of day is past. This being so, we could invite the readers of even a magazine devoted to the interests of Presbyterianism to the contemplation of no more worthy subject than the life and character of Archbishop Usher.

It is quite true that Dr. James Usher was an Episcopalian, firmly persuaded that that form of Church government was not only superior to every other, but of apostolical institution; but he was, at the same time, far too catholic in his sympathies, too full of the mind of his Master, too mindful that Christ had prayed for unity among believers, to hedge in the Church of God on earth by narrow and arbitrary arrangements; and recognising as brethren all who called on the name of Jesus Christ in sincerity, and who held the essentials of evangelical Christianity, he rejected mere agreement regarding ecclesiastical polity as a *sine qua non* of ecclesiastical communion.

It is pleasant to find one's self in close companionship with such a man as Archbishop Usher. We seem to breathe a purer atmosphere, to be touched with ennobling influences, to be quickened to a better life. We seem to see the venerable form emerging softly from the shades, with mystic, dreamy light upon him; sweet serenity on his brow; the calm, sweet look of old—grave yet benevolent—with tenderness in its gravity ready to break into a pleasant smile; with his ruddy cheek, indicative of the health and vigour with which he was so richly gifted, as if to fit him for the work that had been given him to do; with an indefinable influence radiating all around him, which seemed to indicate that grace, mercy, and truth were the blissful characteristics of this most eminent "man of God."

James Usher was born on the 4th of January, 1580, being, as quaintly remarked by Dr. Bernard, one of his biographers, and sometime his chaplain, "an eminent New Year's gift to the benefit of the whole Church of God, and the honour of . . . his native country." Dublin has the honour of having been his birthplace, although it is not

* Proverbs x. 6.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

quite apparent what special credit any locality derives from a circumstance of the sort ; while, on the other hand, we may presume, no great contention is likely to be raised, outside our Isle of Saints, that Usher derived any very special advantage from being born in Ireland. He was not of the Celtic race, or "mere Irish" (to use an expression of that period, or at least not then long in disuse)—a circumstance which some persons will think to his advantage. On the contrary, he was of the old Anglo-Irish race, one of his forefathers having come to Ireland in the retinue of Prince John, holding the place of usher. His name was Neville, but he changed it to Usher because of his office. While the gay and worthless prince was amusing himself with plucking the beards of venerable Irish chiefs, and otherwise provoking the wrath of the Irish in general, his usher was shrewdly calculating, doubtless, the probable advantage to himself of taking up his abode in this island. John went back to England, with what results we know, and Usher remained in Ireland to be the progenitor of one of the most illustrious of Irishmen.

We shall pass over many generations, all of whom resided in Dublin or its vicinity, and come at once to the subject of our sketch. We have few particulars regarding his childhood ; no wonderful narratives of astonishing precocity,—reading Greek when ordinary children are occupied building houses of cards, or exercising the juvenile imagination on pictorial representations of Jack the Giant Killer or Jack and the Bean Stalk. It is only said that he learned to read English by the teaching of three maiden aunts, who had never themselves looked on printed page, as they had been blind from their birth. They taught him also to read and love the Bible,—no unimportant or useless training, one may perhaps take leave to say, even in this enlightened age ! and as Usher himself deemed, notwithstanding all his acquirements in after life,—acquirements which would make intellectual dwarfs of not a few of our pseudo-philosophers now-a-days. The Word of God, which he ever called the "Book of Books," was the first piece of literature with which they made him acquainted, feeling, doubtless, that there was something both to instruct and interest even the mind of a child in its stories of old-world ways and wondrous things of old. Perhaps it was this kind of early training, so different from the fairy-tale and blunderbore instruction, that laid the foundation of that gentle gravity which was so distinguishing a feature of James Usher ; and it may be to the training given him by his good old aunts that we are in some degree to ascribe the blessed results of the incident now to be related.

There came a day in Usher's boyhood—he was only ten years old—on which he used to look back, all through life, with humble joy and thankfulness. He happened on that particular day to hear a sermon on the words—"I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." The words of the preacher fell on his heart as seed drops into well-tilled ground, with the rain and light

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

of heaven upon it. To the boy, with his mind full of the stories of that wondrous old book, it was as the voice of God, when it came to Samuel in the silent watches of the night, mysterious and very terrible, and yet with the accents of a Father. As the subtle influence of spring awakens nature from cold winter's death, new life sprang up within his heart. Emotions which, till then, had lain dormant and unsuspected, were stirred deep down in his heart. We can fancy how he may have thrilled and trembled, while his eyes filled with tears, as he saw the veil of life's deceptions rent in twain, and found himself face to face with God. Perhaps it came upon him as one of those mysterious quickenings of our wondrous nature which suddenly overwhelms us with the consciousness of the eternal and unseen; perhaps it came like reviving rain, with the soft warmth of a vernal sun. But, any way, it came!—the day-dawn from on high, the first emotions of a new heart-life which were to deepen, and thrill, and glow, till the silver cord had been loosed, the golden bowl broken, and the spirit had returned to God who gave it.

Dr. Elrington* is exceedingly afraid lest this alleged conversion† of James Usher should bear against the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. He says it is a mere attempt to support the doctrines of Calvinism by a remarkable example; and that from all that has been handed down, it may be concluded that he was one of those happy individuals, who, educated in a deep sense of religion, and brought up in the fear of God, had duly cherished the grace vouchsafed to him in baptism, and had been from day to day assisted from on high to imitate his Divine Master, and "grew in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man." We have not the least intention of discussing this question, and shall merely give the narrative as it has been left to us by Dr. Parr, who had ample opportunities of knowing how the matter was regarded by the Archbishop himself, who, again, had surely some little insight into his own inner life.

About the period which we have reached in our sketch of Usher, a school was set up in Dublin by a certain James Hamilton, in conjunction with one James Fullarton,‡ a circumstance of some importance in a city which, at that period, was very deficient in respect of schools; and although Hamilton and his associate were not what they seemed, viz., veritable pedagogues, but agents sent over by the King of Scotland to advocate, secretly, among leading men in Ireland, his claim to succeed Elizabeth, yet they made excellent teachers. They were men of good acquirements, and under their instruction young James Usher came on apace.

* See his *Life of Archbishop Usher*.

† See Dr. Parr's *Life of Archbishop Usher*. Dr. Parr was domestic chaplain to the Archbishop during the last thirteen years of his life. Dr. Bernard says, in his preface to his *Life of Usher*, that no man living had so good an opportunity of knowing the Archbishop as Parr had had, and, consequently, of knowing his opinions.

‡ See Dr. Reid's *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, last edition, i. 58; also, *The Montgomery Manuscripts*, Mr. Hill's edition, p. 30.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

Meanwhile, steps were being taken to establish a college at Dublin. A scheme with that object in view had indeed been proposed by the Lord-Deputy, Sir Henry Sydney, in 1569, but without effect. In 1594, however, Trinity College was opened, with Hamilton and Fullarton as its first two Fellows. Among its first students was James Usher, destined to be one of its most distinguished alumni.

We shall pass lightly over his career at college,—how he checked his love of poetry, lest it might interfere with more important work ; how, on meeting with the phrase "*Nescire quid antequam natus sis acciderit, id est semper esse puerum,*" he conceived the idea of searching the records of antiquity, at which time he was not more than thirteen years of age ; and how, accordingly, before he was more than sixteen, he had compiled in Latin an exact chronology of the Bible as far as the Book of Kings ; how he had so thoroughly mastered the points in dispute betwixt the Reformed Churches and the Church of Rome, that he was deputed, while still a mere youth, to be the champion of Protestantism in a discussion with a learned Jesuit who had defied the hosts of the heretics ; and how, according to Dr. Bernard, the stripling vanquished the man of Gath so completely, that, after a couple of meetings, the latter retired from the arena.

At twenty, Usher took the degree of M.A. A year later, he was ordained deacon and priest by his uncle Henry Usher, Archbishop of Armagh ; "which," says Dr. Parr, "though uncanonical, yet his extraordinary merit, and the necessity which the Church then had of such a labourer, rendered a dispensation in that case very tolerable, if not necessary." And never had any Church more urgent need of men such as Usher. Indeed, the promoters of Protestantism in Ireland, in the reign of Elizabeth and the early part of the reign of James the First, appear to have depended more on penal laws for evangelising the Irish people than on the preaching of the Gospel and an efficient ministry. Pains and penalties were the order of the day. If an Irishman of the Romish persuasion, preferring the religion of his fathers and his own convictions to the new religion he was required to embrace, absented himself from the service of the Protestant Church, he was liable to a fine, which, when all had been counted, amounted to ten shillings sterling,—not an inconsiderable sum, having regard to the value of money in that age. Here is a list of fines levied in Munster : The Mayor of Cork, £100 ; Edward Galway, gentleman, £60 ; Edmund Murrough, merchant, £60 ; Thomas Coppinger, gentleman, £60 ; Henry Gold Fitz-Adams, merchant, £50 ; Walter Coppinger, gentleman, £100 ; Jeffrey Galway, sovereign (mayor) of Kinsale, £100 *—arguments convincing enough, one should think, to make the Irish people in those days quite in love with Protestantism, and troop in flocks into the bosom of the Protestant Church out of pure conviction ! Of course, measures such as these had no influence whatever in producing that intense hatred of Protestantism which has for so

* Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, James the First, 1606-8. Preface.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

long a time distinguished the Roman Catholics of this island! Mr. Hallam was quite wrong when he remarked that transactions of this sort "have enormously aggravated, both in the age of Elizabeth and long afterwards, the calamities and disaffections of Ireland;"* and it is quite a mistake to suppose that there is any disaffection in Ireland at all, or that Protestantism has been in the least a failure!

We have intimated that the condition of the Irish Church at that era was not very happy in regard to its ministry. Indeed, there is no more woeful picture than that which has been handed down to us of the Irish clergy at that period. Lest we should be accused of giving a prejudiced, perhaps a malicious, statement, we shall request the Archbishop of Dublin himself to give us the result of his own investigations into the matter, and we presume his Grace will not be accused of inveterate prejudice against a communion in which he held a place so distinguished.

The archbishop had been sent by special commission to investigate the state of the dioceses of Cashel, Emly, Lismore, and Waterford; and he says, in relation to what he had discovered there, that the condition of those dioceses was enough to induce the people (the Roman Catholics, of course) to conclude that among Protestants there was *no* religion—churches being out of repair, cathedrals in ruins, and not a few of the parishes without incumbents. "There be some livings in those two dioceses of Cashel and Emly whereof some poor men, priests, and others, carry the name, but they have little learning or sufficiency, and indeed are fitter to keep hogs than to serve in the Church of God."† In the whole of the dioceses of Emly and Cashel, there was not one clergyman competent to preach the Gospel!

We shall next request Sir John Davys, Attorney-General in the time of James the First, who may be regarded, we presume, as another unimpeachable witness, to furnish us with information upon this subject. He says: "The churchmen throughout the kingdom were for the most part mere idols (*sic*), . . . and such as could not read; most of them, of whom many were serving-men, and some horseboys, were not without two or three benefices apiece,"‡ in consideration, probably, of their distinguished merit and eminent qualifications for their sacred office. Even Dr. Elrington—an author, by the way, whose narrow prejudices greatly diminish our faith in him as a writer of biography or history, and who seems to lose his wits at the mere mention of Puritanism and the like—says that on one occasion, when preachers were being appointed to officiate in Christ's Church before the Irish Government, it was difficult to find competent persons who were in holy orders, and that it was necessary to have recourse to three lay graduates of the college, one of whom was James Usher. §

* See Mr. Hallam's "Constitutional History of England."

† Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, James the First, 1606-8.

‡ Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, James the First, 1606-8. Preface.

§ See Dr. Elrington's Life of Archbishop Usher.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

From all that has been said, it will appear that the accession of such a youth as Usher to the ministry of the Irish Church was a veritable God-send. It may be safely affirmed that no such candidate had ever been touched by episcopal hand in the Church of Ireland. Never had such zeal for the propagation of the Gospel, such fervent desire to commend the Protestant religion to the Irish people—not merely in the interests of his Church, but for the salvation of souls as well—such deep and tender piety, and such extensive erudition, been enlisted in the cause of Protestantism in Ireland. A light had broken on the darkness—a clear and lovely light, ever brightening as the age went on.

As a recognition, doubtless, of his extraordinary merit, the Archbishop of Dublin conferred on the young divine the Chancellorship of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin. In 1607 he was appointed Professor of Divinity in Trinity College. But we shall pass by much that would probably have no special interest for the reader, and take up the thread of our narrative at an occurrence in Usher's life which is of some historical importance. It was the year 1615. The Irish Parliament had been summoned to meet in Dublin; and a Convocation of the Church had been convened to meet there also. It was thought expedient to have a Confession of Faith drawn up; for "the state of the Church, as a national establishment independent of that of England, rendered it necessary that its faith should be formally declared, and its future government regulated."* This Confession was compiled by Usher, and is singularly free from narrow sectarianism. Dr. Reid remarks that it "was evidently formed with the view of compromising the differences existing between the High Church clergy and the Nonconformists," chiefly the Scottish Presbyterian clergy settled in Ulster. ". . . It is as decidedly Calvinistic in doctrine as that which was subsequently compiled by the Westminster divines; and it includes, in almost the same words, the nine articles of Lambeth, which the English Puritans had in vain requested to be adopted at the Hampton Court conference in 1604. The morality of the Sabbath is strongly asserted; . . . the validity of ordination by presbyters is clearly implied;† the doctrine of absolution is condemned; Lent is disclaimed as a religious fast. . . . At the same time, no authority is claimed for framing or enforcing ecclesiastical canons, or decreeing rites and ceremonies; and no allusion is made to the mode of consecrating the higher orders of the clergy."

Dr. Elrington is sadly annoyed with this Confession. It was framed, he says, with a strong desire to conciliate the Nonconformists—a very grievous project in a country where there was so much piety and grace of God outside of that perverse race, who, we presume, were little more to be esteemed than were the Philistines of ancient times, or than the Gipsies are at present. He says, besides, that little regard was paid to

* Dr. Reid, in his *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, vol. i. p. 92, last edition.

† Compare conclusion of this paper, pp. 26, 27.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN July, 1881.]

the leanings of the Church of England, and that the effect upon the Irish Church of the introduction of those pernicious canons was woefully detrimental to true religion. But the king agreed to the canons; they were also approved of by Parliament, and became the recognised Confession of the Irish Church.*

In 1620 Dr. Usher was advanced to the bishopric of Meath. Two or three years later, he was raised to the primatial throne of Armagh. It was no inviting field in which he found himself. "For want of catechising and preaching, the poor people that were outwardly Protestant were very ignorant of the principles of religion; and the Papists continued still in a blind obedience to their leaders."† The new Archbishop set to work to win the latter to the fold over which he had been placed, endeavouring to reach the lowly as well as the great, inviting them to his house, and, with the gentleness and humility which always distinguished him, endeavouring to commend to them the religion he held so dear, and which his own stainless life did so much to exemplify. He sought, besides, to win the Scots of Ulster to the Established Church; but he found the rugged Caledonians much too hard-headed to be reasoned out of their Presbyterianism.

In 1640 the Primate went over to England, accompanied by his family, where he intended to remain for a considerable time to study in the library at Oxford, piling up that vast erudition for which he was so remarkable. In the following year occurred the famous rebellion which has made the year 1641 memorable for ever in our Irish annals. All the Primate's plans were changed. He was reduced by one terrible stroke from riches to poverty, so deep that we find him selling his jewels and other valuables to procure a crust of bread, but "submitting," says Dr. Parr, "to God's providence with Christian patience, having long before learned to use the things of this world as if he used them not, and in what condition he was to be content."

The sufferings of Usher were soon to awaken deep and widespread sympathy. The University of Leyden invited him to become "honorary professor," augmenting the usual salary attached to the chair. Cardinal Richelieu asked him to come to France, promising him a "very noble pension," and freedom to use his own form of religious worship. But Usher preferred to remain in England, where Charles gave him the bishopric of Carlisle. From this he was soon removed, in common with his brethren of the English episcopate, though Parliament voted him a compensation of £400 a-year, of which, however, he was soon deprived by the Independents. In 1642 we find him at Oxford, hard at literary work, and preaching every Sabbath in some of the churches; "and though, at some of his services, most of his hearers were learned persons, he rather chose a plain, substantial style of preaching, for

* In 1636, when the influence of Laud was supreme, these canons were superseded by the Articles of the Church of England.

† Dr. Parr's Life of Archbishop Usher.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

promoting of piety and virtue, than studied eloquence or ostentation of learning."

In 1645, we find him in Wales on a visit to his son-in-law, who was commander, on the Royalist side, of a garrison there; but having fallen into the clutches of a band of insurgents, he was dragged off his horse and robbed, losing many valuable manuscripts, the fruit of twenty years' labour. This distressed him more than all the calamities which had befallen him by the rebellion in Ireland. But efforts were made by persons of influence to recover these lost literary treasures; the clergy from their pulpits requested that restoration should be made, and the Archbishop soon had the pleasure of possessing once more his precious documents.

Then there came a day which was to be long remembered in England—a day of sorrow to Usher—the day of the execution of the King. The Archbishop was at that time staying at Lady Peterborough's house near Charing Cross, from the roof of which the fatal spot at Whitehall was full in view. Some of the household had gone upon the roof to witness the last moments of that ill-fated scion of a hundred kings. It was thought that Dr. Usher might like to take a last look at his royal master, and one of them went down to suggest it. Usher hesitated, but at length went up to the leads. The king was addressing the spectators. In silence and in tears Usher looked down on the scene, occasionally lifting his eyes and hands to heaven. The king ceased speaking, took off his cloak and doublet, and awaited the last rude toilet, such as never kingly heart endured more bravely—for we must do justice to that luckless and not ignoble victim of evil training and times full of malignity as well as of noble aspirations. Then the "villain in visard" put up the king's hair, that the axe might strike sharp and sure. Usher's heart grew cold. It was the king who had been his benefactor, who had admitted him to familiar intercourse, and, in Usher's opinion, this was an anointed sovereign who reigned by right divine! The gentle-hearted prelate sickened at the sight, and would have swooned had they not conveyed him from the scene, and laid him on his couch, where he poured out his heart to God, asking for the king grace and strength in that moment of his sorest need. But it was the hour of doom—swift, unrelenting, and cruel doom, and the axe had done its work!

Years have passed, and now Usher himself must prepare to die; it is the year of grace 1655. He is at Rygate. He has passed the period allotted for the days of man on earth, but his constitution seems unimpaired, his mind is still vigorous; his sight, however, is so much injured by constant study that he can scarcely see to write, save in the sun-gleam; and it is sad to mark the indefatigable old man following the sun from window to window, that he may fill up the full measure of the work given him to do on earth. Often did the thought of death occur to him—the evening shades were falling, the light was growing dim,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

and there was a certain sense of sadness, doubtless a premonition of the close of life's short day. His seventy-fifth birthday came, and he wrote in his almanac, "Now aged 75 years. My days are full;" and then in capital letters, "RESIGNATION." On the 21st of March he complained of an intense pain in his side. A physician was called in, but his prescriptions were of no avail; the heavenly mandate had come, and the angels stood behind the veil that hides from us what we may not look upon and live. Usher's day was done. He counselled those around him to prepare for death in the day of health, that at the last they might have nothing to do but to die. He took leave of his kind hostess, the Countess of Peterborough, and requested to be left alone with God. About an hour afterwards, they heard him murmur, "O Lord forgive me, especially my sins of omission"—and one of the purest spirits by which earth has ever been blessed was carried home to the God who gave it.

Though dead, he speaks from the grave in Westminster Abbey, where Cromwell, to his honour, made it a point that he should be laid, beside the grave of Sir James Fullarton, his old preceptor in the Dublin Grammar School. And the memory of this great and noble life shall be green and abiding as the shamrock in the vales of Ireland.

One of the most prominent features in Archbishop Usher is his vast erudition. In this respect, his fame was European. But far above his learning in interest, we place his noble character, elevated and purified by his deep and unfailing piety. He was, moreover, singularly humble, ever esteeming others more worthy than himself; often lamenting the want of graces which he remarked in others, and supposed wanting in himself.

But, for Presbyterians, Usher's opinions as to the relative importance and Divine authority of Prelacy and Presbyterianism have a special interest. That episcopacy, such as existed in the Churches of England and Ireland, had been instituted not later than apostolic times, seems to have been held by Usher as firmly as he believed in the institution of the Christian ministry itself.* At the same time, he held as firmly that a bishop was superior to a presbyter merely from the extent of his authority in the Church, and not from difference in orders; he "even declared his opinion to be that *episcopus et presbyter gradu tantum differunt, non ordine*,† and consequently, that in places where bishops cannot be had, the ordination of presbyters standeth valid."‡ The Archbishop further says:—"And however I must needs think that the Churches in France, who, living under a Popish Power, and cannot do what they would, are more excusable in that defect than those of the Low Countries that live under a Free State, yet for the testifying my

* See his "Original of Bishops and Metropolitans briefly laid down."

† That the bishop and presbyter differ only in degree, not in order.

‡ See Appendix to Dr. Parr's Life of Usher, in which he makes reference to a work by Dr. Bernard.

EM

CATHOL

comm

memb

I shou

isters

minist

disagr

or dis

with

adher

again

dictio

specie

to giv

havin

chara

place,

So tol

of the

when

visite

break

rupte

hand

Th

with

from

Usher

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

communion with these Churches, which I do love and honour as true members of the Church Universal, I do profess that with like affection I should receive the blessed sacrament at the hands of the Dutch ministers if I were in Holland, as I should do at the hands of the French ministers if I were at Charenton." Again—"For the agreement or disagreement in radical and fundamental doctrines, not the consonancy or disconsonancy in the particular points of ecclesiastical government is with me (and, I hope, with every man that mindeth peace) the rule of adhering to or receding from the communion of any Church." And, again—"The intrinsical power of ordaining proceedeth not from jurisdiction, but only from order. But a presbyter hath the same order *in specie* as a bishop; *ergo*, a presbyter hath equally an intrinsical power to give orders, and is equal to him in the power of order; the bishop having no higher degree in respect of intension, or extension of the character of order, though he hath a higher degree, *i.e.*, a more eminent place, in respect of authority, and jurisdiction in spiritual regiment." So tolerant was Archbishop Usher, and so desirous of availing himself of the assistance of all true evangelical ministers, that, on one occasion, when Mr. Blair, one of the Scottish Presbyterian ministers of Ulster, visited him at his residence at Drogheda, the Archbishop said it would break his heart if the ministry of the Scottish clergy there were interrupted; and, he added—"They think to cause me to stretch forth my hand against you, but all the world shall never make me do so."*

There were men in Usher's day who regarded such opinions as these with intense hostility, and such there are still; but let us turn away from these, and close, as we began, with thoughts of good James Usher!

RICHARD CUNINGHAME.

EMIGRATION AS A CURE FOR IRISH DESTITUTION.

IT is with no shadow of political purpose that we make reference in these pages to a clause of the Land Bill, which has passed its second reading in the House of Commons by a vast majority. We write under an overwhelming sense of the practical urgency of the subject, and our remarks are limited to the emigration clause. Our object is to produce a few witnesses to testify to its great importance, and its urgent necessity.

Our first witness is JAMES H. TUKE, author of "Irish Distress and

* See "A True Narrative of the Rise and Progress of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland (1623-1670)." By the Rev. Patrick Adair. Mr. Adair was almost a contemporary of Usher, as he died in 1694.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

its Remedies." Mr. Tuke is a banker in Hertfordshire. He belongs to that benevolent community, the Friends or Quakers. In every time of Ireland's distress, this Society has proved to be most earnest and liberal in its endeavour to supply the wants of that country. In the awful famine of 1846, Mr. Tuke, along with Mr. Forster, the present Secretary for Ireland, and his venerable father, were deputed to visit the famine-stricken districts, and to give relief from funds supplied by their own denomination. When famine once more threatened Ireland two years ago, Mr. Tuke again came to its relief, and, from a fund provided as formerly, he was enabled to supply wants which the two great funds of the Duchess of Marlborough and the Mansion-House could not undertake. On his return home he published the book referred to, as a record of the deep distress and wretchedness he had witnessed in a large part of county Donegal and the province of Connaught, and also to present his view of some of the remedies. To all who take an interest in the destitute multitudes of Ireland, this work will prove deeply interesting in nearly every page.

Mr. Tuke visited almost every hamlet in a large portion of county Donegal. In such regions as at Carrickbridge, where the population has been largely dependent on fishing, but where both this resource and the potatoes had failed, he says that their circumstances were deplorable. The neighbouring district of Glencolmkill, about ten miles square, is inhabited by a small farmer and cottier population, whose rents vary from 15s. to £2 or £3 per annum, the average rent of holdings in the parish being 35s. Their cottages, he adds, are utterly unfit for human habitation. You find, perhaps, a goat or a cow lying in one corner; and you perceive a miserable heap of rags, constituting the bed, on which you are likely to see a hen laying its egg.

At Kilcor, the destitution was seen in the countenances, which resembled "the famine faces" Mr. Tuke had seen so often in 1846. Five hundred families in this parish were receiving relief. Their average holdings are about one acre of arable land, with a cow's grass. Many families were lying on the bare stone floor, with scarcely any covering. He supplied them with a hundred blankets. This he gave frequently in destitute districts, and in extreme cases he added some money.

At Meenacladdy he found a turf dwelling which few could have supposed a human abode. In it he found a woman with several children cowering over a small fire. There was neither chair nor table in the place. The bedstead had a small ragged coverlet, beneath which was some straw. The children, or others who could not find room on it, slept on the bare rock or earth of the floor, in the thin clothes they wore all day, with a little straw or hay beneath them. The family had no resources left. Had it not been for "the charity meal" they must certainly have starved. The husband had been in Scotland for the harvest, but came back without any earnings; and, being now in debt for rent and for meal formerly got, he was completely beaten. What makes the

CATHOLIC
condit
men v
any e
return
is fre
incur
tunate
In
Lagge
but th
person
neigh
wretc
In
cluste
the s
so fa
occur
hard
these
of wa
away
nothi
or on
rente
is a
bered
specu
rents
more
with
impr
again
and
the
to te
meal
wan
cost
week
head
in I
inde
In
cove
scatt

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

condition of this wide district the more deplorable is the fact that the men who go to Scotland for the harvests had returned that year without any earnings, and some had to borrow money both when going and returning. On an average, two go from each family. A sum of £8000 is frequently realised thus. This sum pays their rent and the debt incurred at the store for the previous year's supplies, which it is unfortunately the custom to owe.

In ordinary years, the boys and girls go to parts of Ulster called the Laggan on hire for the summer months, bringing home their wages; but that year they got none. So this parish, containing eight thousand persons, was so much the poorer by both sums. But many of the neighbouring parishes throughout this part of Donegal were in the same wretched condition.

In Connaught he found a village near Westport, formed by a cluster of houses. To describe it, he says, would be only to repeat the same story of wretchedness and want with which he had become so familiar, both in this province and in Donegal. The frequent occurrence of such instances only made him feel more deeply how hard was the lot of hundreds, nay, thousands of the families of these small Irish farmers. The land lay low, and was swampy and full of water. The large main drain, which ought to have taken the water away to the sea, was choked up. The owner lives away, and does nothing. Few rents had been paid. Some said they owed one year's, or one and a half-year's rent, others more. The lands were highly rented, and very few tenants had any money or stock left. This estate is a sample of many small ones which have been sold in the Encumbered Estates Court. It was purchased some years ago by a mere speculator, who sent down a valuator for the purpose of raising the rents to the highest possible point. He doubled them, it was said, but more probably raised them from 50 to 80 per cent. This was done without the slightest regard to the poverty of the tenants, or to the improvement or reclamation of the land. The estate was then sold again at a large profit, and the rack-rented tenants have grown poorer and poorer, until the calamities of the last year have brought them to the utmost verge of destitution. Many of the families were from seven to ten in number, and the small weekly allowance of two stones of Indian meal to a family hardly sufficed to support life. The children looked wan and thin. Mr. Tuke got the figures sent him, and found that the cost of supporting fifty-six families there did not exceed £9, 10s. per week, or £38 per month for 294 persons! This is but one penny per head per day, or under thirty shillings per year! Can life be supported in India, or anywhere in the wide world, for less? Some of them indeed had a little milk in addition.

In Mayo, Mr. Tuke drove over a very wild, stony, desolate region covered with boulders and large granite slabs. Many villages were scattered among them. It seems incredible that any sustenance can be

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

gained from this rocky wilderness, rivalling Petra in its barrenness. Not less remarkable is the high price the people pay for their miserable holdings.

During the earlier part of his visit, Mr. Tuke made an estimate that 600,000 persons were receiving some amount of relief in the seventeen western counties, which form the scheduled districts. This, he says, was objected to as being in excess, but subsequent information and the experience of the Dublin Committee seem to prove that this number was below the actual figure, and that the real number relieved cannot fall short of *one million*, out of the population there of two and a-half millions, or one-fifth of the population of all Ireland!

We come now to advert to Mr. Tuke's proposed remedies. He confines these to the west of Ireland. He considers that the want of remuneration for the tenants' improvements has been productive, directly or indirectly, of most of the social evils of the country. He then speaks of migration and emigration. He thinks it must be admitted that there is a very large class of small tenants in the west of Ireland for whose circumstances no land legislation can be considered a remedy; and that the occupation of very small farms, without other employment, is not a benefit to the tenant. For these, the only available means of relief appears to be migration or emigration. Migration, or scattering a portion of the people upon a few of the thousands of acres of unreclaimed land, chiefly bogs, appears very tempting. But when the drainage, reclamation, and the time during which the families require to be supported, are taken into account, it would be found very costly. "Why," said a bishop to him, "should we object, if they can obtain one acre of good land in America worth ten acres of this reclaimed land here?"

So deeply and earnestly has Mr. Tuke felt that the only efficient remedy for this class is in a judicious system of emigration of families, that he has gone to America and surveyed several States there. He gives a decided preference to Canada, because it is in the British dominion, and because there only can the richest soil be obtained entirely free, without money and without price. Thus, he says, can the overcrowded districts be relieved, and the further advantage gained of leaving more land for those who remain. On his return, he published the result of his visit in the February number of *The Nineteenth Century*. He conferred with the leaders of the Canadian Government, and learned not only their willingness to give freely the choicest land, but also to render every assistance. The great prairie region of North-Western Canada consists of 250 millions of fine agricultural country (nearly ten times as large as all Ireland). Manitoba, with its nine million acres, stands like a square on this great check-board, and is well watered. Its deep alluvial soil is unequalled for the cultivation of wheat. Mr. Tuke met there Irish emigrants who have succeeded admirably.

Our next testimony to the importance and necessity of emigration in preference to migration is Lord de Vesci. He shows, in an article

CATHOLIC

publish
reclam
reclam
the su
and a
quant
a good
J. P. S
bog-la
prove
Pas
than v
ing en
he can
In a p
Janua

"B
for oth
hopele
to alle
has be
conver
to giv
Many
sole r
But to
ing.
genera
visite
after
Quebe
spirits
witho
to gro
that t
reply
Iceland
lighte

A
ary r
of T
rema
"T
oppo
the i
vatio
resul
than
Comp
is wo

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

published in the January number of *The Nineteenth Century*, that the reclamation of half-drained land in Ireland will pay well, but that the reclamation of bog-land will not pay. It will be necessary to reclaim the surface by cutting drains ten or twelve feet deep at great expense, and after all, the land will be of a very inferior quality. A large quantity of the bogs must be left to supply turbary in each district, as a good supply for fires is most indispensable. He states, also, that Mr. J. P. Smyth, M.P., one of the ablest Irish senators, recommends that the bog-lands be planted largely and systematically, and that this would prove much more for the benefit of the country.

Passing from Mr. Tuke and Lord Vesci, let us hear Lord Dufferin, than whom no man is better qualified to pronounce an opinion regarding emigration to Canada, for, while Governor-General of the Dominion, he came into contact with all the classes and nationalities of emigrants. In a paper he laid before the Irish Land Commission (see *Times*, 4th January), he makes the following statement:—

"But for the extreme west of Ireland, what hope is there of any of the devices for other regions in Ireland! Along that region there extends a broad ribbon of hopeless misery, which no change in the relations of landlord and tenant is likely to alleviate. Perennial destitution, accentuated by periodical seasons of famine, has been the sole experience of its inhabitants during the present century. To convert these poor people into peasant proprietors would be impracticable. Even to give them the land for nothing would not prove a permanent alleviation. Many of them have no land at all. What then is to be done? Manifestly the sole remedy is emigration. At this moment, emigration is much discredited. But to any one who, like myself, has seen its effects, such an outcry has no meaning. In my opinion, it is simply inhuman to perpetuate, from generation to generation, a state of things which has been deplored by every traveller who has visited these parts during the last eighty years. Within little more than a week, after a pleasant voyage, a proportion of them might be landed on the wharves of Quebec; the women healthier, the children rosier, the men in better heart and spirits than they have ever been. Four or five days more would place them, without fatigue or inconvenience, on a soil so rich that it has only to be scratched to grow the best wheat and barley on the soil of America." "If it be objected that the pauperised population of the West would make but poor emigrants, I reply, that their previous life will have fitted them infinitely better than the poor Icelanders who had never seen a plough, a tree, or a field of corn, yet are so delighted with their new possession that they have called it *Paradise*."

A fourth witness is Mr. F. Seeböhm, author of an article in the January number of *The Nineteenth Century*, entitled, *The Historical Claims of Tenant-right*. This article concludes with the following pregnant remarks:—

"The economic future of Ireland seems to tremble in the balance between two opposite courses. One is, to satisfy the labouring class by giving them land, and the increasing population by bringing more and more of waste lands under cultivation, and increasing the demand by increasing the supply. What will be the result of this artificial process? The population will continue under higher pressure than ever, until a fresh famine produces a further crisis and another exodus! Compare the waste lands of Ireland with the Canadian prairies, where one acre is worth twenty of Irish bog! Boldly ask which will pay best. Rejoice then if

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

Irish tenants can thus find better investments. If this be the result of 'England's doing justice to Ireland,' then the higher happiness and contentment of her sons will reflect back a greater prosperity on their old country, than any possible ingenuity could secure by making artificial and uneconomical provision for them here, where they ought not to be! Ireland, or England for her, must make up her mind which of these economical futures she wishes to work for."

The Duchess of Marlborough, who has already rendered so great services in Ireland, has set a good example by paying the expenses of fifteen destitute families to Canada, and it is well known that multitudes besides are most anxious to be sent there.

The last testimony we produce is from an article in the *Times* of 18th May:—

"The condition of the cottiers of Mayo and Galway, of Donegal and Kerry, has been frequently described by accurate and impartial observers. It is barely possible for these unfortunate people to keep soul and body together upon their wretched patches of land, even in favourable years, and with the aid of money earned by fishing or by harvesting in England. In some countries, with a different soil and climate, with better markets near at hand, and with hereditary habits of intense industry and frugality, it may be that peasant owners are able to live on three-acre or five-acre farms. But this is not the case in the West, the North-West, and the South-West of Ireland, with no demand for the produce of the soil in neighbouring centres of manufacture, and practically with only one precarious crop, the potato, to depend upon. We do not understand that the Land League contests the danger of maintaining the present cottier peasantry upon the microscopic holdings common in Mayo and Galway, and, in fact, all along the western seaboard. If cultivation is to be carried on with safety among the bogs and stony highlands of these regions, the tillers of the soil must have more elbow-room. Twenty-acre holdings have been indicated as the smallest compatible with public advantage and individual comfort, both by advanced and moderate politicians. It is obvious, therefore, that by some means the soil of the districts now divided among holders of five acres or ten, including those in which the suffering has been the greatest, and in which also the discontent became most formidable last year, must be concentrated in fewer hands. How this concentration is to be effected, except by assisting the superabundant inhabitants to emigrate, has not yet been shown. Even if we waive this difficulty, and allow, for the sake of argument, that the existing subdivision of holdings may continue without evil consequences, it is clear that a great number of the tenants to whom we refer will be unable to profit by the advantages of the other portions of the Bill. They are in debt, not only to their landlords, but to every one else from whom credit has been obtainable; the legal transfer to them of a saleable interest would only result in their being at once "sold up" by their creditors; or, should they escape this risk, another bad harvest would plunge them into hopeless ruin and sweep away all, and more than all, that the Bill would give them. It is idle to suppose that this class will be able to take advantage of the purchase clauses, for no serious politician has proposed that the whole of the purchase money should be advanced by the State on the very unsatisfactory security of these petty holdings. There will be, therefore, a large proportion of the peasantry in the West of Ireland who cannot hope for any permanent improvement in their condition so long as they remain in their present situation. To these must be added the labourers—whether cottiers or otherwise—who have already suffered by the slack demand for work in Ireland and in England. The migratory labourers of Connaught have seen the employment on English harvesting work, upon which they mainly relied until a few years ago, declining, partly through the effect of American competition upon the conditions of agriculture in this country, and

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

partly through the increased use of reaping and mowing machines in farming. It is not to be expected that there will be any reversal of these influences. In Ireland, it is certain that the contemplated changes in the Land Laws will withdraw the landlords' expenditure of capital, and will diminish so far the demand for labour. But a discontented and unemployed body of labourers is likely to be as dangerous as a dissatisfied class of peasant farmers. For the one evil and the other, emigration is the only effectual remedy; and the objections to emigration, so far as they are in any way deserving of notice, do not apply to a system properly conducted with the aid and under the supervision of the Government."

It is earnestly to be desired that, amid all the contention of Parliament over the Land Bill, the emigration idea will not be either swamped or overlooked. That the great mass of the Irish have no possible prospect of anything but a life of starvation and misery in Ireland, is actually demonstrated. On the other side of the Atlantic are wide and fertile meadows ready to be converted into the homes of peace and plenty. Can the design of a gracious Providence be doubted? It were terrible to frustrate it, whether by opposition or by neglect.

ANDREW CRAWFORD.

NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE AND HIS TEACHINGS.

THE first recognition of a successful writer is usually a quiet affair, probably shared with others, or with something that is the town talk for the hour. However it may affect his bank balance, or the graciousness of his publisher, you can draw from it no conclusion as to the enduring quality of his work, or the rank he will take in literature. Favouring circumstances may secure for a second-rate venture a handsome return in fame and fortune, or help a noble thing, like Mrs. Stowe's "Uncle Tom's Cabin," to instant acceptance. But it is the test of years only that decides; and some of the loftiest reputations have grown so slowly, that the writer himself never knew how great he was.

Such was the case with Hawthorne. Nearly twenty years elapsed from the publication of "Fanshawe," his first venture, to that of the "Scarlet Letter," with which he fairly conquered the public attention. Always essentially a literary man, he was fain to support himself by uncongenial work, and buried his rare powers in the custom-house of Salem, and the consul's office in Liverpool. Now his fame has become national, and he is accepted as perhaps the leading prose-writer of America.

A biography of Hawthorne can scarcely be said to exist; his life was too uneventful. But we have two considerable sketches of his quiet history, with an enumeration and analysis of his works. The first is by his son-in-law, G. P. Lathrop. Affection for the strong, delicate man,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

and a pride in his subject (though it appears he never saw him), of course colour the book. But while you see he is a friend, it must in justice be said he holds the scales very evenly, and his analysis is keen and his judgment cool. The style of the book is like all of Lathrop's works—excellent, simple in its loving narrative, and, in the discussion of a thought or book, warming at times to eloquence. It is the mine, next to Hawthorne himself, whence one would draw material; and would leave little to be desired, if Hawthorne's meaning lay upon the surface, if it could be seen from any one standpoint, or fully understood by any one person.

The other is by Henry James, junior, beautifully written, at times a match for Lathrop in analysis, and superior in its brilliant surface criticism; but in the main, a failure.

The meaning of history, and all monuments of antiquity, without which they are dead rubbish, is what of life lies behind them. Human action—that is, developed, overt thought—is the true subject of writing; and Europe is richer in material than America, only because the soil is two thousand instead of four hundred years deep. Nevertheless, wherever men have accomplished great and peculiar results, there is matter for him who has a competent eye and pen. New England has certainly accomplished somewhat, and accumulated materials for two hundred and fifty years, of a sort peculiar to itself, for the history and romance that are always going on where strong, thoughtful men live.

The trouble with James is, that he sees *things*, and not *men*. The courts and cathedrals of Europe, its aristocracy and clergy, castles, cottages, and ruins, its pictures and museums, its political societies and sporting clubs, are his materials for writing, without which he is puzzled to account for Hawthorne. So he patronises and belittles the man, talks of the poverty of his mental surroundings, and the thin literary soil of New-England. He should have remembered the old adage: "*Ex nihilo, nihil fit.*" Hawthorne's rich, peculiar grace is not explained by New-England's alleged poverty. He admits the considerable worth of his subject; indeed, has sufficient faith in it to write a most charming book about him, despite its fundamental error. He should have studied *whence* Hawthorne had this power; for nothing is plainer, as James himself admits, than that the man is the outgrowth of his native soil.

It was the most urgent, solemn motives that settled New England. Life there, down to the times of the last French War, was a stern struggle with Nature at hand, and the savages prowling about the outskirts of the colony. Then came the Revolution, the wars of Napoleon, and the troubles growing out of the attempts of England to enforce the right of search, followed by the War of 1812-1814. It was an iron time, for iron men with iron thoughts—a time of history and romance making.

A long peace succeeded; and the seed sown by Jonathan Edwards, and cultivated by Emmons and Lyman Beecher, sprang up in rich

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

harvest. Men had leisure to think. The deep problems propounded by those mental giants lay near at hand, and were relished by the earnest, rugged New-England mind. They were the staples of Sunday sermons, and of discussions during the week, and were in men's thoughts and upon their tongues, as scientific and literary matters are to-day. Mrs. Stowe's New-England novels, "The Minister's Wooing," &c., give a life-like impression of the time. This moral atmosphere, which pervaded society and was its vital breath, passed gradually through phases, which Channing and Parker and the Boston Transcendentalists may be supposed to represent, into the thinking of to-day.

Hawthorne is the exponent and consummate flower of the aspect of the New-England mind at the end of the first quarter of this century, fed by her bounty and speaking her thoughts. We use the word *flower*—for flowers are wont to grow fairest from the rock—in its full meaning of grace and elegance, as contrasted with the soil whence he sprang. Hawthorne could have arisen in no country but New-England, or perhaps Scotland, nor much earlier or later than he did. Earlier, these beliefs were too sternly held for such airy, graceful treatment; later, he might not have had his solemn faith in what he taught.

It is not our purpose to give a sketch of Hawthorne's life, or a criticism of his works; but to develop his teaching in selections from his writings, especially the "Scarlet Letter," and the "Marble Faun;" and give such insight of his earnest, graceful thoughts as we have obtained by loving study. The reader must judge what success we have arrived at.

Hawthorne's first venture was "Fanshawe," a novel, published in 1828, the immature work of a young man, yet containing some strong writing, and giving promise of his future power. He suppressed it, and but two or three copies of the first edition are known to exist. It has since been republished; but we deem it only fair to respect the author's judgment, and so pass it by.

"The Twice-told Tales," which were written for various periodicals during a period of twelve or fourteen years, were collected into a volume in 1837, and published at the risk of his friend Mr. Bridge. Though the papers had been well received, and "The Rill from a Town Pump" had had a wide circulation in England as a temperance tract, they had at first but a moderate success. Hawthorne had now attained a settled moral purpose, elegance of style, with minute flexibility and yet strength of touch. His best historical pieces date from this period; and when handling moral themes, his method of presenting his thought was as yet quite open.

"Mosses from an Old Manse," written at various times, chiefly for the *Democratic Review*, was published in 1846. It contains some of the finest writing of the present age, and was much praised. Hawthorne had now developed his peculiar strength; and, consciously or otherwise, was dealing in nearly every essay with moral problems. He

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

no longer states his point openly as heretofore, but leaves it to be inferred from the story, or sometimes suggesting, at once withdraws it, as a mere passing thought. He teaches of set purpose, and in dead earnest, but would by no means have his readers know they are at school; and, in so doing, despite the modern canon to the contrary, has succeeded in winning solid and growing fame.

He loved to hide his purpose, and as he gained skill and power, made the mere current of the narrative tell his thought. He had a peculiar habit (as has already been said) of advancing an opinion, and then withdrawing it as something quite preposterous—a mere random, foolish idea. That is his true meaning and the *key* of the matter in hand. This habit we will bear in mind, nor allow our tricky writer to impose upon us, as we pass along.

Thus it comes about that Hawthorne has three classes of readers—those who are content with his graceful style and the interest of his story, which is all they see. There are others who, in addition to this, are now stimulated and now annoyed by a shy meaning, peeping from behind corners and leafy coverts, that escapes as they attempt to grasp it. For this reason, some quite dislike our author. "I scarcely think Hawthorne himself knew what he meant," said a friend to me.

These shy meanings are the charm of Hawthorne to the third class—those that can catch them—the soul, so graceful and strong, that gives unity and spiritual life to his best works. The "Marble Faun" especially, is a tantalising riddle, despite its outward beauty, till one grasps the problem he is trying to state.

Our author sometimes uses real incidents, bare facts merely, that are known, or must be supposed to have taken place. But he sees and selects with the eye of genius, and you learn the humour or pathos of life. His description of the Lord Mayor's dinner in "Our Old Home" is most delicious in its realism. You see the mighty board loaded with plate and viands, and the guests summoning their utmost efforts for the occasion. You hear the toasts, and feel the shy man's dismay as he perceives he is caught, and will be brought to his feet before the company.

Quite different is the piece entitled "Main Street," a series of pictures of the principal street of Salem, from the time of the leaf-strewn Indian trail, over which the great Squaw Sachem, a majestic, queenly figure passes, down towards the present. Very beautiful are these pictures, and very real; very solemn, too, as the witch Mania of Salem passes before us; and old Goodman Proctor and his wife lean on each other and totter towards the gallows; and the sainted Burroughs administers consolations as of old, from the pulpit or by the bedside, to his fellow-sufferers—strange madness!—but you see it all.

Perhaps, of all these realistic ventures, the sweetest is one of the shortest, entitled, "The Wives of the Dead." Two married brothers, with the simple habits of a hundred and fifty years ago, had joined house-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

keeping. The modest parlour was common to both, and each bedroom looked out upon its light and fire. Both the husbands had died, the one, a sailor, had been lost at sea; and the other by the chances of the Canadian war. The news had come on two successive days; first to Mary, the sailor's widow, and then to Margaret, the soldier's. The young wives had had the sympathy of the town, and now they were left alone. After a half-tasted supper, they retired, each to her own little lonely room. The doors were open. Mary's strong nature, quiet and self-controlled, had mastered her grief; and exhausted she sank to slumber.

Margaret lay tossing feverishly and wearing out the hours, when, about midnight, through the drenching rain, she heard a knock. It was repeated again and again. At length she arose, more to save her sister pain than for anything else, and raised the window. The kind tavern-keeper was there to say that "News had come from the seat of war. The skirmish she knew about had been a victory. Thirteen men reported dead were alive, and among them her husband, who had been detailed to guard the prisoners. They were on their way home, and would arrive to-morrow;" and with that the good man departed.

Margaret flew to her sister's side. Her sad face was still wet with tears. "Poor Mary," she said, "shall I wake her to make her grief sharper by contrast to my joy? No, I'll keep it till to-morrow." And she went to her room. The reaction came, and blessed sleep with dreams of the morrow stole upon her.

Perhaps two hours after, Mary was awakened by a loud, eager rap at the door. Heavy through grief, she slowly realised what it meant; and then went to the window only to save her sister. In the light of the moon, which now was struggling through broken clouds, she saw an old lover, who had just returned from sea, and "Had come to tell her the news," as he said, "and comfort her." "Why, Stephen," she said with a burst of tears, "I did not think that of you;" and she turned away.

"Nay, but hear me, Mary. We spoke a brig to-day; and who do you think I saw leaning over the bulwarks but your husband, a trifle thinner, but otherwise looking as well as five months ago. There's good news for you, Mary; I could not sleep till I had told you."

Mary, too, rushed to her sister's room, but stopped at the threshold. Margaret's face was flushed. She had thrown her fair arms out, and disarranged the drapery of her bed. A happy smile, as of sweet visions, seemed to light her face. "Poor Margaret," thought Mary, "you will waken only too soon from that happy dream. Sleep on, poor child."

So, as she stooped to arrange the covering and protect her from the cold, a tear, whether of sympathy or gladness, she could not tell, fell on Margaret's face; and she awoke, and they knew each other's joy.

While Hawthorne has given the simple New-England tale we have

outlined, as near to life as may be, he has made a gem of its short eight pages.

Our author, however, gives little, save in his Note Books, as the result of his direct observation. He liked better to take a bit of history, an old story, an every-day incident, and fill it with a new, richer meaning.

One of the best of these is "The Celestial Railroad," which runs a curious parallel and contrast to Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress." The railroad has done away with toiling afoot; Beelzebub has become friend to the Lord of the Way, and Apollyon is engineer to the train. Mount Difficulty is tunnelled, and the Valley of Humiliation filled up. The mouth of the pit in the Valley of the Shadow of Death becomes a principal stopping-place. Vanity Fair is a favourite summer-residence for pilgrims, who frequently stay there months and years together. An effort of this nature is, of necessity, in great measure a copy, and therefore a failure; but Hawthorne's thought is quaintly original, and the piece is as thoroughly excellent as the satire on fashionable religion is keen and discriminating.

Hawthorne, however, was most at home when dealing with some keen psychological problem. Half of the "Twice-told Tales," three-fourths of the "Mosses from an Old Manse," and all of his larger works are of this character. The charm of Hawthorne's genius is that he gives such deep insight into the mysteries of man's soul and conscience; and his familiarity with them—as of one much at home in this solemn, shadowy realm—is his originality. He is embodying in these sketches, seemingly so graceful and slight, the study and suffering of years; and both his thoughts, and the dress they wear, come so readily, because he and they have met before.

Sometimes an awful thought is the burden of the essay. "Young Goodman Brown," a story of the Salem witchcraft, lurid with infernal fires and despairing in the hopelessness of its theme,—what it would be to lose faith in human kind,—is perhaps the darkest Hawthorne has written. It is one of the best, also; but with all its fascination, it makes one's flesh creep.

"Egotism; or, the Bosom Serpent," deals with the curse of selfishness, or rather selfness—if we may be allowed the word. A man has swallowed a serpent, which transforms him into its own nature, and lives within, and gnaws and stings. It gives the power of recognising whatever is ugliest in others by the kinship of mutual bosom-serpents; and as he challenges the relation, the answering hiss tells that the poor possessed wretch speaks true. This confraternity of evil is admirably worked out. At last the victim's wife and a friend succeed in diverting his thoughts a brief season, and he is saved; for could he for one instant forget himself, the serpent might not abide within him.

Instead of a moral problem, we have often a fanciful conception. "The Procession of Life" pairs men high and low, and marshals them

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

into companies by various affinities—by disease, by misfortune, &c. You see the army of the bereaved, very steady in their order, and the swiftly dissolving ranks of the joyful. The benevolent pass by in couples, the founder of a hospital with the widow of the two mites at his side. Lord Byron and Robert Burns lock arms by the right of genius. And the guilty link themselves, the high-born matron and her sister of the streets, by the kinship of crime. Death marshals the ranks ; and they move, so strangely, so rightly paired, into the future, past the grave, where the marshal leaves them, towards the judgment of a justice and mercy-loving God.

The more important of Hawthorne's works deal with the problem of Sin, and are both profound and most wholesome in their teachings.

The "House of the Seven Gables," written in the fall of 1850, and published in the winter of 1851, might have been entitled the "Heirloom of the Curse ;" and has for its theme how sin and wrong are punished by further wrong and more sin, to the third and fourth generation.

A humble carpenter, Matthew Maule by name, earlier even than the times of the Salem witchcraft, had built a little cottage, and cleared two or three acres from the forest in the outskirts of the town. He was a silent, reserved man, with the gift, dangerous for the times, of mesmerism. Near him, Colonel Pyncheon, a heavy-handed, iron-hearted man, had a grant of land from the Legislature, which he claimed covered his neighbour's lot. It would appear right was on Maule's side ; for, notwithstanding the influence of wealth in those early days, the case was long undecided in court ; and his antagonist got possession only after Maule's death under charge of witchcraft. It was remembered afterwards that the Colonel had been foremost in urging on the dread work ; and that the origin of the suspicions against his neighbour, arising no one knew how, were traced back to him. Maule declared he had been hunted to death for the sake of his property ; and on the gallows, pointing at Colonel Pyncheon, who was sitting near on his horse, charged him with it, and left him his curse, saying, "God will give him blood to drink."

Nevertheless, the Colonel took possession, and built the House of the Seven Gables on the coveted ground, employing as superintendent of the work the son of the murdered man, who, with the blunt feeling of the age, was not unwilling to put a goodly number of pounds into his purse thereby. The Colonel's portrait was fixed against the wall of the principal room, and by the provision of his will was never to be taken down. Behind it was a secret recess for valuable papers, known only to himself and the builder.

On the day of the house-warming, when all the magnates of the colony, with the Lieutenant-Governor, had assembled, Colonel Pyncheon was found dead in his chair, with a broad stain of blood upon his beard and the ruffles of his snowy shirt. Thus old Maule's curse was fulfilled against the first proprietor of the House of the Seven Gables.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

From that time the families came down, the Pyncheons, on the whole, well to do ; but with a mysterious blight hanging about them. More than one, too, of the line passed from life in the way of the old colonel, and thus kept alive the tradition of the wizard's curse. The Maules struggled along just on the verge of poverty, often coming to the almshouse in old age, and finally disappeared. Space forbids that we trace the story further than thus to outline the problem on which it turns.

Five principal characters come before us. Hepzibah is a withered, angular spinster, full of family pride, unpractical, forbidding, and austere in personal appearance. All outward circumstances are to her disadvantage. She is the subject of Clifford's beauty-loving criticism ; and is continually brought into contrast with Phoebe's freshness, beauty, and wonderful New England faculty. But there is another side. Hawthorne has achieved in her one of the rare triumphs of literature. He has drawn her so unselfish and kind-hearted, so true to her brother, and willing to stand between him and harm—in a word, so full of heart beauty that you laugh at the absurd old creature, and reverence and love her all the while.

Clifford, her brother, had exquisite taste, and was fond of all fair, bright things. Had the Pyncheon wealth been his, it would have filled him full of harmonious life, and under favourable circumstances he might have become an artist himself. But he had been foully wronged by his cousin Judge Pyncheon. In his youth, the judge had been dissipated, ruffianly almost, living on the bounty of his uncle and namesake, Jaffrey Pyncheon. He had been detected by the old man ransacking his private drawers. Anger and excitement brought on a crisis of the family disease, and, choking with a burst of blood, he fell dead to the floor. The young man deliberately continued his search, found a new will in favour of Clifford, which he destroyed, leaving an older, which conveyed the estate to himself. He then so arranged matters that Clifford, accused of murder, barely escaped with a life imprisonment. For reasons of his own, the judge had recently secured a pardon for his cousin, after about thirty years of imprisonment ; and Clifford had just come home to Hepzibah, broken in body and mind. The struggle of his delicate nature, so long repressed, to reassert itself ; the wholesome influence of Phoebe, as of sunshine and the fragrance of flowers, and the utter self-forgetfulness and wealth of love with which poor old Hepzibah hovered about her unfortunate brother, show Hawthorne's delicacy and power.

Though anything loathsome cannot properly enter art, there is room for what is dreadful, wicked, and full of shuddering horror. So to Judge Pyncheon Hawthorne has given, in addition to the dark traits of the old colonel, a sort of sultry benevolence and an oily hypocrisy, that is saved from contempt by his remorseless strength.

When a young man in his uncle's house, Clifford had discovered the secret spring of the recess behind the old picture, and found there an

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

Indian title, confirmed by Act of Legislature, to a large tract in Maine. He was outlawed, but it pleased Clifford to hint his knowledge of valuable papers, and to make it the basis of many a wild story. The judge now inclined to think there might be some truth in it, and resolved to wrench his secret from his cousin, and therefore had brought him home.

After a stormy interview, he forced Hepzibah to send for Clifford to the parlour. While he awaits him there, the fate of the family overtakes the judge as he sits in the old Pyncheon chair. The chapter entitled "Governor Pyncheon"—the "Requiem of the Doom," we would call it—is perhaps our author's finest passage. It is exquisitely wrought in its highest notes,—the watch stopped in his hands, the mouse running over his knee—and in its deep undertone of retribution; awful in its irony, awful in its solemn joy, and yet more awful in its justice. We hesitate not to say, it cuts a vista through earth's tangled wrongs towards a higher Justice, yet says of such as he: "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision."

Besides the little New England cousin, so innocent and bright, we have a young photographer, Holgrave by name, keen, versatile, the typical Yankee in his intense yet wholesome activity; an Iconoclast in his democracy, but upright, true; in every way a contrast to the mustiness, decrepitude, and ancestral wrong of the Pyncheons.

Hawthorne intends him to stand at the opposite mental and moral pole from the judge; and brings out skilfully the interior rectitude of the youth. Holgrave reads to Phœbe the history of the Indian title. As he recites it with passion and magnetic interest in his story, he finds he has the same power over the bright girl that his ancestor used so disastrously for himself and sweet Alice Pyncheon. He puts the dark thought from him, respects the freedom of Phœbe's soul, refuses to weld the chain of secret power, when but to will was to do. Thus Hawthorne tries him, and shows he is worthy to lift the curse. He is Maule's descendant and representative, has been an observer all through the story, is friendly to Clifford and Hepzibah, and most naturally has fallen in love with Phœbe.

At the time of the judge's death the latter is absent. Clifford, borne away by half-imbecile excitement of mingled fear and joy, has fled, dragging Hepzibah with him. Holgrave is alone in the house, and can take in the full meaning of the event. He photographs the judge in his chair, and the belongings of the room, that he may thereby protect Clifford, notwithstanding his unfortunate flight.

Scarcely is he done when Phœbe returns. The old story, so old, and yet so new and sweet, is repeated. There alone, they two in the house with the dead, pledge faith and love, with solemn, holy joy. News comes within the week that young Jaffrey, son of the judge, has died in Europe. Clifford, Hepzibah, and little Phœbe are heirs of his wealth. The representatives of the wronged and the wrong-doer come together, and the doom is lifted. The movement of the piece passes to the

quick measure of joy. They change the House of the Seven Gables for the judge's mansion on the hill ; and the curtain falls.

We have no space to speak of the humour that drew little Ned Higgins, Hepzibah's first customer, and Uncle Verner, the philosopher of the poor-house, and many other graceful pictures scattered along the way. Had he so chosen, Hawthorne could have surpassed the broad humour of Dickens with a wit as subtle and racy as his own wine of sunshine from the vineyards of Monte Beni.

As the family pass to their new home, it but remains that we speak of the love-scene between Holgrave and Phœbe. This has often been criticised—is objected to even by Lathrop—as too sudden in its sharp transition from the "Requiem of the Doom." Hawthorne's intuitions of the befitting and the beautiful are nearly perfect. I should prefer to think his critics had mistaken his *thought*, rather than that his insight had failed him in the very denouement of this beautiful work. No ! Hawthorne is right. If we have caught his meaning, heaven's benediction and joy could no more help rushing in when that wrong, centuries old, was righted in love, than the sunlight could help entering the gloomy, old house when Holgrave threw open the windows.

We have criticised Mr. James sharply ; but his verdict as to this book is honourable to himself, as well as just to Hawthorne. "It is a large and generous production, pervaded with that vague hum, that indefinable echo of the multitudinous life of man, which is the real sign of a great work of fiction."

We have spoken of Hawthorne as a teacher. He proposed nothing of the sort ; but being possessed by some grand thoughts, did his best to give them expression, and have them accepted by the world. From the standpoint of some such central idea each of his principal works must be judged. His theme was never merely something on which he chose to write, holding it at arm's length, and turning it about to see what aspect pleased him best. It took possession of him ; and he wrote straight out towards the development of an eternal principle, and not the goal of a work of art.

In another paper we shall see further illustrations of this in the "Scarlet Letter" and the "Marble Faun."

A. C. ROE.

A SYMPOSIUM ON THE ROBERTSON SMITH CASE.

I.

THE recent discussions in this case have started several questions that have much significance and interest, not only for the Free Church of Scotland but the other sections of the Presbyterian Church. It has been thought by influential friends that some benefit may accrue from a brief friendly discussion of some of these questions, regarded from different points of view. Each writer must be held alone responsible for his views, *The Catholic Presbyterian*, as such, taking no side. The following statement is submitted for the purpose of initiating the discussion.

1. The first question raised respects the soundness of the critical views—this being indeed the foundation of the whole. Certain views regarding the Levitical legislation, involving the dates and authorship of several of the books of Scripture, and having an important bearing on the inspiration and authority of the Bible, have been brought forward with the claim that they are not only true in themselves, but destructive of what has hitherto been held on the subject. Deuteronomy is brought down to the time of Jeremiah, and Leviticus to that of Ezra; and the statements which attribute them to Moses are represented as “legal fictions;” well enough understood among the Jews, and implying no more than that they were legitimate developments of the Mosaic legislation. It is alleged that this view, if accepted, removes many difficulties in Old Testament history, and makes it far more self-consistent than it has appeared heretofore.

The question then is, Is this view correct? Is it according to fact? There are some to whom it appears, on the face of it, utterly and almost impiously untrue. They regard it as so flagrantly incompatible with the inspiration of Scripture that they will not look at it. With this representation I do not agree, because the grounds on which it is alleged to rest are of the nature of facts, and you cannot fairly dispose of alleged facts simply on account of their ugly look. You must ask, Are they truly facts, or are they not? It is highly unsatisfactory to meet alleged facts by inferences from doctrine. The new theory ought, therefore, to be examined as a question of fact. But a searching examination demands considerable time—possibly years, and after all it may be impossible to reach a clear conclusion on that footing. The evidence relied on is almost wholly internal, and valuable though internal evidence is as an auxiliary, it is very rarely of itself conclusive. The idea that has been broached of a committee of scholars to settle the critical question in the space of a few months, I regard as utterly futile, and out of the question.

2. The next question is the question of *liberty*. In considering this

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

question, we must have special regard to the quarter from which the new view has come. Its advocate is a theological professor in a Church which has founded and which maintains certain theological chairs for a definite purpose. Has he a right to advocate these new views *in that position*? This raises a general question of great importance to all Churches—how far is a theological professor entitled to maintain, or at liberty to teach, new views? We think it ought to be conceded that to some extent he is at liberty to do so, because, as Dr. M'Kendrick, the able professor of physiology in the University of Glasgow, remarked, he would be a very poor professor indeed if he did not add something to what had been established by his predecessors. (Perhaps Dr. M'Kendrick did not consider that in theology the opportunity for additions is far more circumscribed than in a new science like physiology.) But the present question is, Do Mr. Robertson Smith's views lie within the limit of what is fairly and reasonably legitimate to a professor of divinity? To this question my answer is, No. And my reason is, that they amount to a revolution. I am not saying here whether they are true or false, but only that, with relation to what has hitherto been held, they are revolutionary—entirely subverting old ideas of the structure of Scripture. This is apparent at once, and can hardly be denied. Now, whatever liberty it may be right for a professor to have with reference to new views, I maintain that he cannot claim, from the Church which gives him his office, a right to teach what is revolutionary. Is he then to teach the old views against his conscience? By no means. His duty is to retire from a position which he can no longer fill satisfactorily. It is open to him, if circumstances permit, to pursue his inquiries elsewhere, possibly within the ministry of the Church. But, at the least, he ought frankly to place himself in the hands of the Church, for whose work he holds his appointment as professor.

I regard the case of Mr. Robertson Smith as a most unfortunate one for trying the question of the legitimate liberty of professors. Though I would never dream of comparing it in other respects with the case of Mr. Bradlaugh, I would say that they are alike in this, that they are fitted to damage and obstruct the cause of reasonable liberty. Personally, I think that professors should have a reasonable liberty of investigation. But I differ from those who think that Mr. Smith's case fairly raised the question of legitimate liberty in the Free Church. I hold that from its extreme and revolutionary character it was calculated to throw back that cause.

3. The next question is that of ecclesiastical *right*—the right of the Church to deal with a professor holding views such as Mr. Smith's. Two views are maintained here—first, that if the Church is dissatisfied with a professor, the only constitutional course is to proceed against him by the regular process of libel, specifying his errors, and proving them to be contrary to the Standards. And second, that over and above this right,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

she has a power to declare that he is not fulfilling the purpose of his office, and at once to remove him from the same.

(1.) As to the right of the Church to libel, there is no difference of opinion. But in regard to the question whether or not Mr. Smith's case is a suitable one for trial by libel, there is a difference. For myself, I have a decided opinion that it is not. The Confession of Faith was not drawn up to test critical theories, and is not adapted for the purpose. Consequently, in using the Confession as an instrument of trial in such a case, you will be tempted to strain certain doctrines unduly, and give them new applications, so as to bring the new views apparently within their scope. Or again, you may be tempted to enlarge the Confession so as, for the future, to declare explicitly the mind of the Church on new questions—a course which is certainly lawful, but not expedient. Still further, the Church would have to commit herself prematurely in regard to the alleged matters of fact which are under inquiry—to commit herself in a way that would render any dispassionate inquiry into these facts impossible for ever so long. Further, trial by libel involves a charge of heresy, and if the libel is proved, it involves the punishment of heresy, thereby giving to the case a quite different character from that which it really has.

(2.) There remains, therefore, the question, whether the offending professor might not be dealt with directly? Might the Church not remove him by a more summary process? This question resolves itself into two. Has the Church the power to do so? and if so, is it expedient to exercise this power?

(a.) Does the Church possess the power? For my part, I cannot but believe that she does. If the Church creates an office for a particular purpose, places a man in it for that purpose, and calls on her people to support it for that purpose, she must surely have a right to see,—nay she must be under an obligation to see, that the purpose is fulfilled. If in certain circumstances a libel is not adapted to secure that object, there must be some other way of securing it. Suppose that a professor of divinity simply left out of his course some important doctrine, such as the divinity of Christ, or the atonement, he would not be liable to trial for heresy, but he would be failing to fulfil the purpose of his appointment; or, suppose that he were of a very jocose nature, and that his theological class was pervaded by an atmosphere of levity that entirely frustrated its object, must the Church look on helpless, because she could not find him guilty of breaking the Confession? In a somewhat parallel case (not altogether parallel, we allow) the Established Church of Scotland removed a missionary at once from his office at Blantyre, in South Africa, not for any charge to which a libel would have been applicable, but because he had been imprudent. She did not even hear him on the subject at all. It might be said that by this precedent, all missionaries were placed absolutely at the disposal of the General Assembly. It might also be said that the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

principles applicable to missionaries being applicable also to ministers, they too were absolutely at the caprice of the General Assembly. These things, however, are not said seriously in this case, because there is not the excitement of controversy about it. In the Free Church such things are said in reference to the Smith Case: it is declared that every professor and every minister is at the mercy of a panic-stricken General Assembly; but such utterances proceed from the excitement of debate; in calmer times there would be more confidence in the good sense, the justice, and the forbearance of the Assembly.

(b.) Was this method, then, an expedient one for the Church to adopt? In some respects it was not. It has drawn down on her very severe criticism. It has caused very furious accusations to be dashed against some of her best and foremost men. But the Church did not feel that she had any other course open to her. It was a painful necessity to adopt this course, with all its risks and troubles. She deemed it necessary to protect herself in the meantime from what she deemed revolutionary teaching. She had no way of determining suddenly and summarily the validity of the new views as questions of fact. She did a painful duty because she saw no available alternative. She accepted the results with much sorrow, but not with any sense of having committed a wrong. On the whole, the course taken appears to have been not only justifiable, but the only course possible.

W. G. BLAIKIE.

II.

I CONSENT to take part in this Symposium not without reluctance, and I do so simply out of respect for my esteemed friend the Editor of *The Catholic Presbyterian*, and in the belief that his sole aim is to benefit the churches by the discussion of a very important question relating to the wise exercise of Church authority in the maintenance of purity of doctrine. I need not say that I should have had more heart to contribute my quota to the discussion before the action was taken by the Supreme Court of the Free Church, by which Professor Smith was removed from his chair. Another prefatory remark I make, —viz., That while I accept the statement of the question to be discussed given by the Editor, I do not regard that statement as an exact reflection of the issue raised at the Assembly, whose proceedings have just come to a close. In the Assembly, doctrine was thrown into the background, and errors of conduct were brought into the forefront, and the inculpated Professor was dealt with rather as a man without sense, than as a man unsound in the faith. But without doubt, whatever might be said in motions and speeches, the real issue raised was, whether a man holding such opinions as Professor Smith had given utterance to in his writings, could fitly be allowed to occupy a chair in a theological institution; and that is the question in which alone

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

a deep interest will be taken by the wider public who have no concern with the tactics of an Assembly debate, or the state of parties and of ecclesiastical exigencies within the Free Church.

Dr. Blaikie has stated his views under three heads. I shall do the same; only I ask permission to formulate my position in my own way. One may ask three questions respecting the views of the late Professor of Hebrew. First, Are they *true*? second, Are they *confessionally legitimate*? third, Are they *tolerable* in the Church, and especially as held by one occupying the position of a Professor?

The first question is, of course, a very important one; yet not so important as Dr. Blaikie's expressions may seem to imply. He speaks of this question as the foundation of the whole. If this means the foundation of the whole judicial procedure in the case, it involves an assumption which I suspect has been active in many minds, and has wrought mischief in the recent troubles; the assumption—viz., that truth and soundness on the one hand, falsity and heresy on the other, are equivalent terms. The assumption, however natural, is unfounded. Opinions may be false, yet not unsound in the judicial sense, because within confessional limits. Within these limits, error is privileged. We all need the benefit of this distinction. Every minister probably errs every Sabbath, more or less, in interpreting Scripture. But he is not therefore amenable to discipline, because he errs in a matter in which he is left to his freedom in the exercise of the duties of his calling. Of course the interpretation of a text is a thing of much less moment than the critical reconstruction of the whole Old Testament, but it serves to illustrate my point—viz., That the truth of the opinions promulgated is not the point on which all turns. It is conceivable that every one of the critical views set forth in the volume "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church" should be, as a matter of fact and evidence, ill founded, and yet be privileged, that is, be opinions very open to criticism, yet not proper grounds of ecclesiastical censure. On this account, the party of toleration have always protested against the idea that their attitude was that of men indiscriminately adopting all Professor Smith's views. Their position has not been, "These views are true," but, "These views are legitimate; it is desirable that they should be formally stated, and that they should be freely discussed without the interference of Church authority to bias or intimidate men's minds." They have not been led to take up this ground by prudential considerations, as if fearing the trouble into which they might be brought by a frank avowal of sympathy with the opinions condemned by so many in the Church. They have taken up this position because it was a good one to fight on, and because it was a ground on which they could all stand. On the merits, they are not all of one mind. Some go much farther than others in agreement with the opinions in dispute. Perhaps the average opinion of the party is, that some of the late Professor's views are probable, others very doubtful, and that not a

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

few of them refer to matters in which it is not likely that we shall ever reach certainty ; and that, with reference to all, the need of the Church is, not hasty condemnation, but leisurely, thorough, and unintimidated discussion. This is certainly my own position.

Are these views, then, which have caused such a turmoil, confessionally legitimate ? That is the second question. Our contention as a party is that they are ; and in this view some of those who have assisted to remove the offending Professor from his chair, notably Principal Rainy, concur. As I understand, Dr. Blaikie also virtually accepts it. He says, "The Confession of Faith was not drawn up to test critical theories, and is not adapted for that purpose." Another view was taken by the Assembly of 1878, led by Sir Henry Moncrieff ; but it more and more comes to be understood and admitted that the view which then prevailed was a mistake, and that it illustrated the truth of Dr. Blaikie's remark, that "in using the Confession as an instrument of trial in such a case, you will be tempted to strain certain doctrines unduly, and give them new applications, so as to bring the new views apparently within their scope." It is well that on this point there should be a prospect of general agreement, as tending to narrow the question regarding the Church's duty towards modern Biblical criticism. It is one road definitely ascertained to be unsuitable for leading the Church to a desirable conclusion. It may indeed be thought that we are far enough yet from general agreement as to that, when the party of toleration at the Assembly of this year in effect demanded that Professor Smith should be dealt with by libel if he was to be dealt with at all. But that demand was in reality an *argumentum ad hominem*, and said to opponents, You must deal with Professor Smith in the ordinary, regular, judicial way, or let him alone. Practically, it was a denial of the competency of any other mode of procedure. And in that view it was a legitimate attitude to take up. But apart from the purposes of defence, I doubt if many of those who supported Dr. Whyte's motion in their hearts wished a libel, or believed that a new process could come to any good. Be that as it may, I for one thoroughly agree with those who think that the Confession is not an instrument which can enable a Church to suppress the critical views of Mr. Smith in a fair, straightforward way, without special pleading and forced construction. If these views are dangerous, so dangerous as to be intolerable, they must be got at in some other way ; by new legislation, by revision and enlargement of the Confession, or by bringing into play some "reserve of power" supposed to inhere in the Church. Dangerous or otherwise, the opinions in question are confessionally legitimate,—cannot be interdicted to professor or minister on confessional grounds.

But are they not so dangerous as to be intolerable, and if intolerable, has the Church no way of dealing with them, though her Confession does not help her ? In putting the question thus, I do full justice, it will be admitted, to the case of our opponents, and I will try to answer it

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

with the greatest possible frankness. I respect the feelings of those to whom the views in question appear intolerably dangerous. But I say that in a case of this kind you have to consult not only your feelings, but your judgment, and to consider well what is prudent and wise. The case is this: certain views are promulgated by a professor which *ex hypothesi* are confessionally legitimate, and which on that very account many regard as *entitled* to toleration, whether we like them or not. These views, moreover, are advanced in an apologetic interest, in good faith, by one who is admitted to be not only a first-rate Biblical scholar, but an earnest believer in a revelation of grace, involving miraculous manifestations. They are views, moreover, whose proof is derived from Scripture itself, which is loyally accepted by the accused as authoritative; and it is claimed for them that they tend, not to diminish, but to enhance the value of Scripture as a means of edification. On all these grounds these views are regarded by many, especially among the younger ministers of the Church, not only without dread, but with intellectual interest and with religious sympathy. In such a case, it is obvious, the Church must proceed with great caution. It is not enough to assert the existence of a reserve of power. It has to be further considered, far more carefully than has been done, whether its use in such a case is wise. The existence of such an absolute power I gravely doubt. I regard such power as un-presbyterian. I think the theory of our constitution is, that whatever evils cannot be dealt with by ordinary judicial procedure are to be borne with, are tolerable, minor evils, to be dealt with, if at all, only by moral appliances, not authoritatively, but persuasively. I suspect the power claimed for the Church is not an *ἐξουσία* but merely a *δύναμις*, the force of a majority resolved to get rid of an obnoxious man. The *δύναμις*, of course, we do not dispute; it is a melancholy fact, as indisputable as the power of an avalanche to sweep away a devoted Alpine village. But, granting the *ἐξουσία* in the abstract, either as a right inherent or as a right capable of being secured by legislation, would its exercise in this case, or in any conceivable case, be wise? I doubt it; in the present instance, I more than doubt; I am fully persuaded. What you need in present circumstances is a maximum of moral influence to deal with a *leaven*, with a leaven, too, that is not purely evil, but has its good side. But authority and moral influence are in inverse ratio; the more of either, the less of the other. Authority prevents free discussion, much needed, and creates prejudice, not against, but in favour of the views incriminated, and so defeats itself. If authority is to be exerted at all, it must be a *minimum*, just enough to keep the Church from being compromised by, or held responsible for, the opinions under dispute. The course actually taken exceeded this minimum, and it has not the excuse pled by Dr. Blaikie of being "the only course possible." The Church could have saved herself from being held responsible without going so far as

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

to remove the offender from his chair. She might have said :—We regard these views with grave doubt, and with serious concern. We are unwilling to condemn them, or to interdict inquiry ; but we are solicitous for the honour of the Word of God. Therefore, we issue this declaration to the world. And, moreover, the Church might have instructed Professor Smith not to teach these views to his class. Mr. Smith has never disputed the Church's right to say what is to be taught in the theological halls. The motion that was carried in 1880 in effect recognised this right, by admonishing professors to remember that they are not set for the propagating of their own opinions, but for the maintenance of the doctrine and truth committed to the Church. It may be said such an instruction would not have been efficient to neutralise Professor Smith's influence over students. Will the removal of him from the chair be more efficient for that end ? For that, you must trust not to authority, but to other means. The less authority the better. *Professor Smith*, instructed not to teach doubtful opinions dreaded by many, would have been far less influential than will be *Mr. Smith*, deprived of his chair, but remaining in the Church an object of intense sympathy, and a rallying point for a new school. I must, therefore, respectfully hold that the recent Assembly acted unwisely, and followed the guidance, not of sound judgment, but of heated feeling or temporary expediency.

I add only one word more, and it has reference to Dr. Blaikie's hint about securing liberty and keeping right with conscience by voluntary retirement. I do not presume to determine what the duty of one in Professor Smith's position might be. I will simply say that the question is not so easily settled as Dr. Blaikie seems to think. His idea is based on modern denominationalism, or what may be called the club-theory of Church fellowship, which is entirely opposed to the true conception of the Church as catholic, and suggests offhand modes of solving difficulties which cannot be entertained by those who give to the idea of catholicity its due.

A. B. BRUCE.

III.

So long as judgment in the case of Mr. Robertson Smith hung in suspense, it might have appeared unbecoming for churchmen in other communions, however strongly interested, to express any public opinion on the issue. But the whole case has now become public property. Thoughtful students over Protestant Christendom who care for the future of Biblical study have been following it with keen eyes. Sister Presbyterian Churches are even more closely concerned. The credit of the Free Church of Scotland and its prosperity are dear to all the members of the Alliance. Still more dear are the interests of orthodoxy on the one hand, and of sacred scholarship on the other.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

These are things which it is the business of all our Churches to reconcile. A grave interest, therefore, awoke when a problem, which may any day be presented to any of our Churches, had to be faced and resolved by one so strong in able men, and so rich in recent memories, as the Church of Mr. Smith. There need now be no delicacy in canvassing a decision which already has echoed through all English-speaking countries and beyond them.

It was by a *coup-de-main* that the General Assembly got rid of the case. One must concede that it had some provocation, and a good deal of temptation, to take a "short and easy method" of shaking off the difficulty. Provocation arose—first from the maladroit appearance of the Professor's latest article in the *Encyclopædia*, at a moment when the whole Church had been lulled into a quiet confidence that all was over; next, from the delivery and publication of lectures to laymen, in which the origin and growth of Hebrew literature were handled all along the line in an extreme and revolutionary fashion. These were irritating novelties in the situation. There was a yet graver temptation. It sprang out of the long continuance of agitation within the Church, out of the formation, within her bosom, of two clearly defined parties, and out of threats of secession in case of defeat, more or less loudly muttered on either side. Still, these things by themselves scarcely appear to an outsider to justify so "heroic" a remedy as a summary vote of want of confidence, followed up by deprivation of office. Action like this by a representative court would unquestionably strain the constitution of any Presbyterian Church. Whether it did actually violate the constitution of the Free Church in particular (as is alleged by some) is a question which must be left to Free Church authorities. But all Presbyterians are interested in the question which has been raised in this form—May a professor of theology, who, besides being appointed by a Supreme Court, has been inducted into office by a Presbytery, precisely as ministers are into a pastoral cure, be lawfully deprived of office without libel in a way which would be admittedly illegal if applied to deprive a pastor of his cure?

This is a question for experts in Church-law. Practically, I feel bound to assume that the leaders of the Free Church would not have stretched to its utmost the authority of the Assembly in order to create a doubtful and hazardous precedent, which wore at least the air of an injustice, unless they had known or believed the internal situation to be more critical than onlookers were aware of. Jonahs are not flung overboard unless the ship be labouring. The Free Church must be herself the best, indeed, the only judge of what is necessary to her own safety and the preservation of her unity, which is her strength. If the thing was to be done, it could hardly have been done in a better or more becoming spirit than was exhibited on both sides. But the fact that the Free Church has seen meet to cut for the moment the knot of a situation which others expected her to untie, is a result to be regretted

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

in the wider interests of Church liberty and of the reconciliation with dogma of modern difficulties in Biblical criticism. It is not fair to say that the Free Church has shirked the task which Providence seemed to offer to her without adequate reasons for doing so. But it seems a pity that such reasons should have existed.

Apart from personal and constitutional points, the net result of the Assembly's decision has been to leave the liberty of investigation and of opinion on matters of Biblical criticism practically untouched. This, I presume, is the reason why the issue has not been accepted as a defeat by the party of freedom, but rather hailed by it as though in some sense they had scored a success. It is plain (even without its being claimed in any formal document), that it remains still as free as ever it was for a minister or elder in the Free Church to hold, advocate, or teach views respecting the date and authorship of Old Testament books, or respecting the development of Hebrew legislation, which are utterly opposed to the traditional and accepted views on those subjects. Even with regard to her professors of theology, whom alone the decision can be said to touch, the decision does extremely little to curtail or define their liberty of teaching. Because, under given and peculiar circumstances, a certain man, whose views are most advanced, and whose case had, in the course of some five years, got entangled with irritating complications, and had awakened keen strife, is sacrificed, not to a presumption of his heterodoxy, but to the well-being of the Church, not by a libel but by an unexampled exercise of power—this affords a very slight indication indeed how much liberty in similar directions the Church would allow to another man under different circumstances. Such a case creates a precedent, no doubt; but it is a precedent which no sober Church would be in a hurry to imitate. Scarcely any light can be thrown on the interpretation and application of Church-law by a decision in which the usual legal methods for the interpretation and application of law have been expressly superseded. Strictly speaking, I take Professor Smith's deprivation to be only an episode in the drama, not its catastrophe.

Now, in one aspect of it, this belongs to the unsatisfactory character of the recent decision. In another aspect, I should say it is a matter for congratulation. To get rid of an individual by a *coup-de-main* may or may not be a mistake. To gag a whole Church by a *coup-de-main* would have been nothing short of a disaster. If ever in the Free Church, or any other Presbyterian Church, the limits of permissible opinion on debated points of scholarly criticism are to be abridged, it must be by due course of libel, prosecuted to its legitimate issue under all those safeguards which, by Presbyterian procedure, fence the rights of individuals, and drawing its validity from a fair application to the case in hand of the Church's subordinate standards.

How such a cause, if raised, would have been decided in the courts of the Free Church, it is now idle to conjecture. The chance of such

CATHOLIC

a caus
happe
the F
tion o
which
shoul
profes
notice
yet re
both t
charac

I sa
two th
which

On
measu
from
those
writer
not be
that c
and a
build
tions
almos
part
cautio
hand,
Churc

Th
hither
the m
kept
facts,
proba
like t
discon
have
alarm
rudel
of ph
Robe
sion
elsew
philos
labou

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

a cause arising is, I presume, very small. The best thing that can now happen probably is, that (the source of recent irritation being removed) the Free Church should by degrees settle quietly down to the prosecution of her practical work ; that the intricate problems of scholarship which have been prematurely forced upon the attention of her laity, should be relegated to the libraries of her most erudite divines and to professional literature ; and that when they again attract prominent notice, scholarship may have worked out results more solid than it has yet reached, and the people may be found better trained to estimate both the evidence for such results, and their harmony with the Divine character of Holy Scripture as the guide of faith.

I say this, because throughout the whole of this commotion in Scotland, two things have become, to my mind, very evident, with the mention of which I shall conclude.

One is, that the new school of Old Testament criticism is out of all measure stronger in assault than in reconstruction, and is yet very far from having attained to reliable conclusions in its attempt to explain those phenomena of the Old Testament with which it deals. The present writer makes no pretension to discuss such phenomena, but I hope I shall not be deemed presumptuous if I venture to say, that any such theory as that of which Mr. Robertson Smith has constituted himself the exponent and advocate is still a long way from having made good its case ; that it builds a vast structure on narrow, and, to some extent, uncertain foundations ; and that its conclusions are so largely conjectural, that they are almost certain to be materially modified ere all is done, if not in great part abandoned. If this be so, then the argument is as strong for caution and abstention from dogmatism in the investigator on the one hand, as it is for free scope and toleration of his speculations by the Church on the other.

The last remark I would offer is, that the teaching eldership has hitherto been unwisely reticent regarding those classes of facts on which the modern school of Old Testament critics build. The laity have been kept unacquainted with the facts. Theories, therefore, built on those facts, find laymen utterly unprepared to estimate how much or how little probability they possess ; while the bearing of such facts upon doctrines like those of inspiration and the authority of revelation, is novel and discomposing. A bolder handling of Scripture at an earlier period might have saved many devout minds from much needless or exaggerated alarm. But the lesson has perhaps been learned. The lay mind has been rudely awakened, in Scotland at all events, to the existence of whole ranges of phenomena, previously unsuspected ; and whatever may become of Mr. Robertson Smith's theories, the avenue to a patient and honest discussion of this whole region must henceforth be kept open in Scotland as elsewhere. So far as Biblical criticism does handle facts of history and philology, only the sheerest obscurantism would desire to foreclose its labours. So long as its students are still at the tentative, exploring, or

(CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.)

hypothesis-weaving stage of their science, they have a right at least to elbow-room, if not to a more generous recognition. So soon as they shall have formulated their results with tolerable solidity, completeness, and unanimity, it will be time for the Church to say how far, and in what way, her ancient faith in the revelation of God is to harmonise itself with the fresh light which Providence shall then have vouchsafed upon the structure, composition, and design of that manifold and marvellous literature which lies crushed up into a volume within the boards of our Hebrew Bible.

J. OSWALD DYKES.

IV.

THE limits allowed for my remarks on the three preceding papers oblige me to pass over some points on which I should have liked to say a few words, and to proceed at once to notice what I regard as the most questionable position maintained by Dr. Bruce. Let me just say here, however, what I have said elsewhere, how heartily I admired the tone and temper of Dr. Bruce's Assembly speech, and that I have studied his present statement, not only with the respect due to his ability, but with the sincerest desire to appreciate the full strength of the position which he occupies.

What I am struck with is Dr. Bruce's almost pessimist declaration, that in the presence of all novelties in doctrine—of all nineteenth century heresies—the Free Church, as a Church, is practically powerless. She has bound herself with the Confession as with a chain, and must be content to look helplessly on, no matter what extravagances are being committed by her members beyond the limits laid down two centuries ago. "Within (Confessional) limits," he says, "*error is privileged.*" "The case is this: certain views are promulgated by a professor, which *ex hypothesi* are confessionally legitimate, and which on that account are *entitled to toleration*, whether we like them or not." "I think the theory of our constitution is, that whatever evils cannot be dealt with *by ordinary judicial procedure*, are to be borne with as tolerable minor evils, to be dealt with, if at all, only by moral appliances, not authoritatively but persuasively." (The italics are, of course, mine.)

Dr. Bruce in his closing paragraph gives us a glimpse of a higher doctrine of the Church than these quotations would naturally suggest. He supposes the case of a professor hesitating to resign because looking upon the body he serves, not as a club, but as a branch of the Church Catholic. The Professor has been commissioned to teach all the truth he knows, and, for the sake not of a denomination but of the Church, he must testify at all hazards to the light that is in him. I venture to think that if Dr. Bruce will carry these high views with him, and place himself by the side of the Church as he has placed himself by the side of a professor, he will hesitate to crush it under those mechanical

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

restraints which are equally unsuited to its condition as a living organism seeking daily guidance from the Holy Spirit.

It seems to me that the claims of the Confession of Faith to repress the Church's action have been pressed to the verge of absurdity. Its history, and the history of creeds in general, appear to have been very much lost sight of. The Confession was not a compact or concordat entered into after consultation between the membership of the Church on the one hand, and the General Assembly on the other. It was imposed upon the Church by the General Assembly, in terms of the article that "*it belongs to Synods to determine controversies of Faith.*" By-and-by, it was taken as the basis on which a State Alliance was formed, and, of course, a pledge was given in it that no one would be challenged for teaching which it approved. But the Church which framed it had far too high an idea of its functions to suppose that it was then constituting *the authority* under which it could alone exercise discipline, or was laying down the limits within which it would be free to use the power of the keys.

There was no regular Church Creed till the Council of Nice. Discipline in all its forms was exercised previously only under the guidance of the Scriptures. On the principle that the Nicene Creed was scriptural, Arius and those who adhered to him were excommunicated. But it never occurred to the bishops of the time that they could not go beyond it in their discipline. The first Council of Ephesus excommunicated Pelagius, although there was then no anti-Pelagian Creed; and the same rule was followed with, for example, the Nestorians. By slow degrees the Creed grew until it assumed the dimensions it took at Westminster, and now perhaps there are not many heretics who will not be caught in the extended net. But it is not in the least inconceivable that in these intensely speculative days there may appear new and "intolerable" errors, from the side, not merely of criticism, but of physical science and philosophy; and those are, I think, not wise who would deprive the Church of a right which it has exercised from the beginning, to deal, under a sense of immediate responsibility to her Divine Head, with each form of evil as it presents itself.

I know, of course, what will be said on the other side. There may be "tyrannical majorities;" and would it not be safer, if you cannot tolerate a doctrine, to condemn it formally in your Creed? But a tyrannical majority may be got not only to vote in one Assembly, but even to add (hastily) an article to the Confession, and I think most of us agree that that document is big enough already. Such acts as that which took place in May are not likely to occur often. There was no "panic" about it, as the secular newspapers insist on our believing. It was an act done deliberately at the close of a five years' agitation. And the Church may well be trusted to exercise its inherent authority in a similar way when a like conjunction of circumstances require her to do so. I cannot say that I like Dr. Rainy's phrase—"a reserve of power."

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

It suggests to me, so far, the idea of illegitimacy. The power exercised at last Assembly was, to my mind, in no sense an illegitimate one. It was the outcome of exactly the same authority which appears in all cases, when she pronounces her sentences, not in the name of the Confession, but in the name of her living Head.

It was maintained by an excellent minister in the General Assembly that if the Free Church did not do what he recommended, it would have "*no future*." I am not sure that I understood what he meant. It occurred to me at the time that, if the Free Church were to keep to its old lines as an evangelical Church, and prosecute, with increasing diligence, the work of evangelising the world, it might have a very grand future. But in reading Dr. Bruce's paper I have been much impressed by this, that if his view of our position is correct, the Church's future is not very much in its own hand.

"Error," he says, "is privileged" if it is outside the Confessional lines. The highest Court of the Church has no *right* to interfere with a man, however revolutionary his doctrines may be, if he does not positively traverse the Creed. Dr. Bruce, it is true, admits that a professor may be forbidden to teach his peculiar views to his class; but I do not see, from his standpoint, what title the General Assembly has to give any such direction. The professor may, if he is disposed to be friendly, consent to accept advice; but all extra-confessional teaching is lawful, and if he is in the mind indicated at the close of Dr. Bruce's paper—if he thinks of himself as a member of the Church catholic commissioned to make known all the truth—I do not see how he can teach his class without letting them know his mind. And if he takes this view, and insists on saying what he thinks right, it seems to me that, under the theory expounded by Dr. Bruce, he can maintain his post and teach his "error" in defiance of the General Assembly. Hitherto, the case we have had to deal with has involved the Old Testament only. But all the world knows that the New Testament has also been placed in the critical crucible, and that ere very long we may have to fight for the integrity of the Gospels. It is not, therefore, a violent supposition that there may soon arise among us a New Testament professor of the advanced school, claiming the same liberty as has been demanded for Professor Smith, and that thus, in one unspeakably important department, the control of what is to make her future, may go absolutely beyond the Church's power. A principle is often best judged of in the light of the consequences to which it leads; and I cannot but think that some who are now enamoured of what they suppose to be no more than the liberty of fair inquiry, will think again when they see that the theory under which it is contended for implies the abnegation by the Church of one of its most important functions—that of controlling the education of its own candidates for the ministry.

In regard to all extra-confessional "errors," the Church must always be left, I cannot help thinking, to exercise the right and responsibility

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.

of saying for itself, as occasion demands, whether they are "tolerable." It is, of course, a debateable question whether that is the character of the views of Mr. Smith. Professor Bruce says that many have no difficulty whatever in bearing with them; and those who are of this mind were quite entitled to ask that room might be made for them, and to protest when their demand was not granted. But, on the other hand, a large majority of the Church's representatives took a different view, and would have felt deeply aggrieved if they had not had the opportunity of formally expressing their dissatisfaction. They voted accordingly under the constraint of conscience. It is possible that they did what was wrong, and may come to repent of it. Still, with the convictions they had, they could not help themselves; and it is worth noting that they went forward without passion, and in the face of very considerable "intimidation." So great a majority voting steadily against the popular breezes spoke emphatically for what was the mind of the Free Church; and if ever its supreme executive could be justified in removing a theological teacher, it was in the case which has called forth so much animadversion. Nor, one might add, can it be said that the dissatisfaction had no patent ground in reason, when both Dr. Blaikie and Dr. Dykes agree in openly pronouncing Mr. Smith's teaching "revolutionary."

What Dr. Bruce says about the practical ineffectiveness of the dismissal method to arrest the critical movement is not quite "relevant." The immediate object of the Church's action was not to stop inquiry, but to relieve itself of responsibility in connection with the propagation of the opinions it condemned. The vote would have been the same, though the risk had been greater of the heaven being intensified. All the same, I am not in the least sure that Mr. Smith's views will spread the faster that he now speaks from the ground. What gave piquancy to his teaching was, that it came from one who was a theological professor in an orthodox communion. There is now a hope that his argument will be examined for itself; and it may be that Dr. Dykes forecasts truly the judgment which will come to be pronounced upon it. Professor Smith's conclusions, he says, "are so largely conjectural that they are almost certain to be materially modified ere all is done, if not in great part abandoned."

I have room for only another remark. It has been insisted upon that the Assembly's judgment was inconsistent with the professorial tenure of office—which is *ad vitam aut culpam*. But it seems to be forgotten that the sentence proceeded, in express terms, on the existence of a *culpa*, and that, therefore, on this side, we simply encounter again the old difficulty of whether a *judicial process was indispensable to disclose the culpa*. It is idle to talk of altering the terms of the tenure. The professors themselves would be among the last to agree to a change which would make them hold office at the pleasure of the Assembly, and nobody believes that this is how they stand now. They are in

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

office *ad vitam aut culpam*. But, while fully recognising that fact, the Church cannot, if it would, divest itself of its right and duty to maintain its position as "the pillar and ground of the truth," and to interpose its supreme authority when one of its chairs is used as an instrument of revolution. That of itself is a "fault" sufficient to justify interference, but our professors may well feel secure in their posts, when it is only under like extraordinary circumstances that they will ever be touched.

Dr. Dykes gives good advice when he says that the best thing for the Free Church now to do is to settle down quietly to her practical work. Though we differ about how the Old Testament was constructed, we are all agreed about the message which God wishes us to carry to sinful man. For the results of the critical inquiries, the world can afford to wait, but it cannot afford to wait for the Gospel. Let us then in any case attend to the business for which a plea of "urgency" may well be advanced, and perhaps there will come to us a reflex benefit. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." Labour for Christ may bring light from Him.

NORMAN L. WALKER.

V.

How should the Presbyterian Churches think of the action of the Free Church Assembly of 1881 in the Robertson Smith case? What is its significance for them?

I am delighted that it has occurred to the Editor to answer these questions by this Symposium. For it has already answered them. *In vino veritas* for once; my four friends round the table have blurted out the whole truth. They seem to me, indeed, to tell all the same story. They tell it, of course, with different feelings, and in varying phrase, and they may sometimes verbally contradict each other. But when he has the good fortune thus to meet four representative clerics of the same school, no educated layman need have the least difficulty in translating what each says into terms of the other. And in the present case, there is scarcely any alloy of words to be evaporated in order to reach the solid ring of rounded fact which unites the four.

A month has sufficed to dissipate the cruder dross. For example—
1. Some men at the Assembly (not the weightiest) held that error in the case of professors calls for interference more loudly than in that of ministers. But we have passed over that here. For, had the facts been reversed—had it been a popular preacher who for years brandished the new views from the pulpit without being stopped by the courts below—precisely the same persons would have pointed out, with equal plausibility and greater truth, that while professors are entitled to some freedom, the Church must use its reserve of power to guard strictly the preaching of the Word. As it is, Dr. Dykes' outside surmise that the same action in the case of a minister would be "admittedly illegal,"

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

finds no countenance from his northern brethren round our table, as it found none from the leaders of the Assembly. Their argument goes on the general and broad ground common to professors and others. 2. And that broad and general question relates chiefly to the maintaining of opinions—opinions which are alleged to be revolutionary. It does not relate to conduct. No doubt Mr. Walker observes that there was in the Assembly's finding some suggestion in "express terms" of what he thinks *culpa* on the part of Mr. Smith, and I have no doubt most of those who voted for it took the same view. But as to this *culpa* there was not even the pretence of trial; and those who were responsible for the resolution earnestly disavowed a view which their followers as inevitably took. But even in Mr. Walker's paper, as in those of all the others, the main ground of the Assembly's action is the suppressing of audacious opinions. And in his view its chief excellence is that opinions (the question of tolerating which had divided the Church nearly equally during four years of a judicial inquiry) were on this one day, without an hour's investigation, held intolerable. Of course, on the other side this is supposed to be the main element of injustice to the individual, and of injury to the Church. But 3. I shall venture, for the purposes of this paper, to throw aside the alleged injustice to the individual, grave as it is. It was sharply noted by some who had no sympathy with Mr. Smith personally. One man quoted to me the words of our native poet in that earlier case of summary "suspension" of a Scottish ecclesiastic—

"Although the loon is weel awa',
The deed is foully done."

And it was more sharply felt by those who watched with admiration the emergence, from the dangers of a keen temperament and the mere habits of the scholar, of that victorious wisdom and strength which culminated at last, in Mr. Robertson Smith, in a statesman-like self-restraint and a churchman-like self-sacrifice.

But the main thing for other Churches is not the administrative question—that of justice; but the constitutional question—that of Creed. That this is the hinge of the situation in Scotland, we are all agreed. It is of course therefore the thing in which other communions are chiefly interested.

How has this consensus been attained? I should think some men in America must be very much surprised to find both sides of the Free Church of Scotland urging the *irrelevancy* of the Westminster Confession to the chief question which has for years divided its Courts. The Free Church has not suddenly come to this result. It is a large body, and requires to be educated with some degree of pressure. And the educative pressure has been, as is usual, in the first instance, from Providence without rather than from conscience within. Ten years ago, it was quite as certain as it is now, that a creed two hundred years old

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

could not honestly be applied to modern critical questions. But the thing had to be worked through; and accordingly, the last four years have been occupied in the futile attempt to lay the Westminster Confession alongside Mr. Robertson Smith's views by way of libel. The well-meant effort has been like that of the ape in the Eastern story, when a fly settled on his master's sleeping face. The faithful brute hurled a rock at the intruder, and the gratitude of the awakened Pasha was not greater than that of the Free Church in 1881. At the last Assembly, Professor Smith again claimed—what has from time immemorial been the constitutional right of all Scotch Presbyterians—to be tried by the Confession. It was flatly refused by the solid vote of those who most affect orthodoxy, increased by the vote of not a few who affect higher things. Many of them thought, as the author of the preceding paper does, that the Westminster Confession really condemns Mr. Smith's views. But they thought, also, with him, that it has come to be a "chain," a "mechanical constraint," a net, "big enough already," but useless for such waters. Or they held, with Dr. Blaikie, that in forcing the old formula to apply to the new and unforeseen, you necessarily strain it, and strain your conscience too. And so it comes to pass that the old Confession has this year been thrown aside by the almost unanimous voice of the Free Church; for though Dr. Bruce and his friends make it their banner, most of them, as he explains, believe that Mr. Smith's views are not touched by its definitions. Whether that be so or not, I give no opinion; but I have no doubt that the summary act of the majority was against all Church law. It has instantaneously established the other or younger section of the Free Church in the constitutional position which for years they had claimed.

Dr. Bruce, in his singularly clear, calm, and self-consistent paper, has used rather remorselessly this position of constitutional superiority. He and his friends stand on the Creed, meaning by that the old Confession of Westminster. And for those who are content to take that old Creed as equivalent to the present Faith of the Church, there is really no escape from his arguments. Dr. Blaikie says, most truly in one sense, that Mr. Smith's opinions are revolutionary. But it is a distinct sin against Christ to abridge the liberty of His disciples to hold opinions, revolutionary or otherwise, which do not infringe the Faith. Mr. Walker would almost like to take the stronger position. He hints at a present Faith of the Church, distinct from its written Creed. But when the argument suggests that it should utter its present Faith, he thinks the old document "is big enough already." I doubt whether these matters will ever be right until our Churches turn to face this question seriously, not "as clubs," but as part of the Church catholic. And when they do so they will find themselves confronted by two principles:—1. The form in which a Church now holds its Faith is the only form in which it has a right to utter it. 2. The length or detail of the Creed is a matter of principle, as truly as the accuracy of

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

its contents, or the order and relative emphasis in which alone we have the right to utter them. These questions lie behind ; but what is admitted is, that the Free Church has, in the present case, thrown aside its written Creed on account of its inadequacy to deal with revolutionary teaching, and that a duty to do so again is urged upon it in the case of "all novelties in doctrine, and all the nineteenth-century heresies," past and future. I am not satisfied that the claim is wholly baseless. Indeed, my chief objection to the decision of 1881, arbitrary and therefore unjust as I consider it to be, is that it was an illegitimate means of relieving the conscience of the Church from the wholesome strain of facing its admitted duty on critical and other questions. That strain, if diffused over a reasonable number of years, it could have borne with absolute safety, and I believe with advantage. The course which has actually been taken may be overruled—there are signs that it is possible—for still higher good to Scotland. But even those who apologise for it will scarcely commend it to other Presbyterian and constitutional Churches for imitation. The same questions no doubt press on them also. But they are yet free to follow the more excellent way.

A. TAYLOR INNES.

VI.

THE privilege of reply might almost be dispensed with in the present case, so fair is the spirit, and so admirable the temper in which the various writers have expressed their views. On two points only am I disposed to add a word of explanation.

1. In regard to the bearing of the Confession of Faith on the case, I think that both Dr. Bruce and Mr. Taylor Innes have somewhat strained my concessions. I am not to be held as admitting that Mr. Robertson Smith's views are not opposed to the Confession, or are "confessionally legitimate." My chief ground of objection to a libel in his case, based on the Confession, is, the great inconvenience of using an instrument like the Confession for a different purpose from that for which it was constructed, and especially for dealing with views quite unknown to its authors, and involving, primarily, matters of fact. And one of my chief objections is, that that method, when carried out to its issues, tends to restrict legitimate liberty, and prematurely to commit the Church on questions of fact, which it were unwise, without ampler investigation, to press at once to a dogmatic decision. If the Church had declared for a libel, there is every reason to fear that Mr. Smith's views would have been condemned as heretical by next General Assembly, and this condemnation would have included all who hold them. It is mainly to Dr. Rainy that it is due that the Assembly did not take this course. I have no doubt it will be felt, ere long, that instead of the avalanche of condemnation that has been poured on him, he deserves the credit of having saved the friends of reasonable freedom from annihilation in the Free Church.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

2. I do not hold the "club-theory of Church fellowship in opposition to the true conception of the Church as catholic." It happens that I deliberately discard it. But it is one thing to have simple fellowship, or even ministerial fellowship with the Church (neither of these has been touched in Mr. Smith's case); it is another thing to discharge the duties of a special office like that of a professor, or like that of a missionary in Africa, instituted by the Church for a particular purpose. It is of what is peculiar to such a special office that I wrote. And really Dr. Bruce concedes virtually all that I contend for when he says that the Church has power to say what is to be taught in her theological halls. Let us see how our respective views would operate in a parallel case. Suppose a Church, wisely or unwisely, to institute a Chair of Biblical Natural Science, in order to protect the Bible from attack, and suppose that her professor declares himself an evolutionist, while avowing opinions thoroughly orthodox on all confessional questions: According to my view, knowing the opinions of the Church, he ought to offer to resign, but failing that, the Church might fall back on her power to remove him. According to Dr. Bruce, the Church might fall back on her power to say what he is to teach,—and might thus prohibit him from teaching evolution. Would this course be more creditable to the Church, honourable to her professor, and beneficial to her students? In my judgment quite the reverse. Anyhow, it seems to me utterly out of the question to say that between the two views there is all the difference of lawless despotism on the one side, and high regard to constitutional right and liberty on the other.

I write as a professor, and with the feelings with which a professor naturally guards his own office. And I must say that I know of few things that would be less tolerable than to be instructed by the Church not to teach views which I held to be true and essential to a right understanding and use of God's revelation. If I found myself in the position of believing to be true, and of very vital importance, what the Church did not believe, I should feel bound as a teacher to resign my office. I would deprecate the loss of fellowship, and of ministerial fellowship (if I still held to the Confession); but I should not wonder that the Church did not continue to me the right to teach when I was no longer in sympathy with her. If it be said that this is to tie men down by a rigid rule, and to prevent all that germination and expansion which is essential to a healthy Church, I reply that the same thing would result from a prohibition to teach. I think it would be very foolish for any Church to hem in her professors with great rigidity; and I own that in the collateral discussions that accompanied the Robertson Smith case, it seemed as if some brethren were desirous of doing this in regard to more than one other professor. But such rigidity got little countenance. And I cannot but think that if professors make their claim, in a suitable spirit, to a reasonable amount of liberty, they will not encounter any very vehement opposition.

W. G. BLAIRIE.

CATHOLIC

THE

[THE p
world
thorou
of its
manne
to that
tion.
presen
counse
the fol
answer
presen

THE p
and in
critici
last n
frank
utilisi

It
Revis
notin
Versi
famil
point
recon
jarrec
all, I
those

Ye
foren
of my
eager
writt
to w
some

In
revis
treat
it we
truth
such
In sp
was

THE REVISED VERSION—HINTS FOR ITS USE.

[THE publication of the Revised Version, now circulating over the English-speaking world in millions of copies, is a great fact. It is evident that the version must be thoroughly and intelligently examined and judged of, with a view to the determination of its ultimate place. We purpose in this journal to take up the subject in a twofold manner. We have arranged for a series of scholarly, critical papers similar in character to that of Dr. Schaff in our last number, both on changes of text and changes of translation. In our next number, we expect a paper on the changes of text. We wish also to present what may be called the *pastoral* view of the new version—the thoughts and counsels concerning it which eminent pastors are now presenting to their people. In the following pages we give four letters on the subject, mostly sent by return of post in answer to our applications to several eminent pastors. In future numbers we hope to present further communications of the same kind.—EDITOR.]

I.

GLASGOW, 13th June, 1881.

THE publication of the Revised New Testament is an event of remarkable interest and importance. It has been freely and, on the whole, fairly criticised, and criticism may be left to scholars such as Dr. Schaff, whose valuable paper in last number many have perused with profit. It will be a gain if clergymen will frankly exchange their thoughts, or offer suggestions, as to the best modes of utilising the fruit of the ten years' labour of the Revisers.

It may be assumed that ministers are themselves diligently studying the Revised Version, and, with the aid of all the critical apparatus at their command, noting and forming an opinion as to the differences between it and the dear Old Version which has reigned supreme for 270 years. I confess that the more familiar I become with the Revision, the more thankful I am for it. On some points I am content to suspend my judgment; to some alterations I cannot yet reconcile myself; but other divergences from the Old Version which, at first, jarred on the ear or the feeling have already lost their harshness, and, regarding all, I cannot but defer to the ability, acumen, research, and reverent care of those to whom the English-speaking world is deeply indebted.

Yesterday, I made the Revised Version the subject of the Church services both forenoon and afternoon; and I have received many evidences to-day of the interest of my people in the subject. I believe that the members of our Churches are eagerly expecting information and help. No doubt, much has been and is being written; but, at least in a city like Glasgow, there are many who have not time to weigh all that is written; and it is only natural that persons should look for some utterance from the pulpit on a matter of such great significance.

In all frank speech on the occasion for the revision and the results of the revision, it is impossible to avoid issues which require tender and discriminating treatment. But it seems to me that the pulpit should not avoid such issues, as if it were afraid of them or had aught to conceal; and those to whom Evangelical truth is dear should not allow it to be said that the fresh and free statement of such issues is limited to men of the most advanced so-called schools of thought. In speaking to my congregation, I did not hesitate to give what information it was possible, in a short space of time, to give as to the "most ancient authorities"

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

with which our Authorised Version has been compared, as to the manner in which the Greek text has been determined, and the reasons for some of the more prominent omissions and alterations.

I need not inflict on your readers a *résumé* of what I said. But perhaps I shall not be accounted presumptuous if I notice one or two points bearing on the use to be made of the Revised Version.

One gain which I indicated is, that it will relieve minds from a bewilderment which sometimes they felt on account of the frequent assertion of differences between the Authorised Version and the Original. "I hate that *Original*," someone said, "ministers are always parading their learning, and then they know that we cannot check them." Let it be admitted that there is a measure of truth in the remark. But now, between minister and people, there is this Version. With it, the people can check the minister; and the minister can appeal to it, and need never appeal beyond it for the more correct sense of a passage. This, it seems to me, should tend not to the unsettlement but to the settlement of minds. Persons know what the best scholarship on both sides of the Atlantic has decided to be the best rendering of the best Greek text.

The Revised Version, of course, must win its way, as the Version of 1611 did. I did not recommend, as has been recommended, that whilst the New Testament lessons should be read by the minister in the Authorised, they might be followed by the worshipper in the Revised Version. This hinders the force of the *reading*, which ought to go for much, and introduces a critical spirit into the exercises of worship. But I recommended that there should be copies in the pew for reference, and that the Scriptures read in Church should afterwards be compared with the New Version; that Sunday-school teachers should use the Revised Version in preparing to teach from the Authorised; that the young men in fellowship meetings, and young people in advanced Bible classes, should make use of it; and that all should have the Revised, along with the Authorised, Version for private reading at home. And I pointed out that the paragraph form, the marginal notes, the distinguishing of quotations and arranging the poetry quoted in parallel lines, the better punctuation, &c., were most valuable aids to study, and tended to open up the consecutive thought and pith of Holy Scripture.

I concluded with expressing the hope that, with this Revision, there may be a new outpouring of the Spirit from on high. God, in His providence, seems to be calling us to the revision of much beside the English New Testament. The foundation standeth sure. But we may hear Him bidding us take heed how we are building thereupon. Surely, we can trust Him for this, that He is leading His people like a flock. If some souls are shaken out of traditions, let them feel that, as John Mackintosh says, "God may be bringing them to accept and welcome the truth as though they were the first to whom it had been presented." Anyhow, the Scriptures are meant to be the Word, the speaking out of the truth and love of God in the lives of men. Shall we not pray that the Revised New Testament may be followed by a revised Christianity in a revised Church—a Church in which the current Christianity is compared, not with the later copies, but with the most ancient authority—that Holy One of God who has the words of eternal life!

JOHN MARSHALL LANG.

GLASGOW, 13th June, 1881.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

II.

THE Revised Version of the New Testament is certainly far from perfect. For my own part, I do not sympathise with those who complain of its minute alteration of prepositions, articles, and tenses, for such corrections are often very valuable, and accuracy in handling sacred oracles can hardly be carried too far; but I am surprised and vexed at the timidity which has spared bad grammar, and has in many cases put preferable readings only in the margin, even when the American Company proposed to put them in the text; and I am quite dissatisfied with the new version of such passages as Acts xxvi. 28; Philip. ii. 6. Moreover, while glad to be rid of the "bottles" in Matt. ix. 17, the "beasts" in Rev. iv. 6, and "Easter" in Acts xii. 4, I am at a loss to know why I should still have to read in the Gospel of Saint Matthew of "wise men" as a translation of Magi; of "devils," when every one knows that *Diabolos* never occurs in the plural in the New Testament; of a "whale" as the creature that swallowed a man; of "tares" as resembling wheat; or, in the Epistle to the Romans, of "mortifying," instead of the plain English "putting to death;" or of the saints "groaning," to signify their pantings of hope. Nevertheless, I should be very sorry to pronounce the Revision a failure. For one instance in which it disappoints us, there are a hundred instances in which it merits approval and thanks.

As to the use of the New Version in churches, no Presbyterian minister will think of determining the point on his own individual authority. Auxiliary or supplemental reference to this Revision may, of course, be made; but King James's Bible will lie on our pulpit desks till the Church authority that we respect in each country admits another version, or at all events renders its use optional.

But, though the Revised Version may not be on the pulpit desk, it will make its way into the pews. And this may have a double advantage. The public reading of the Scriptures may be followed with new interest and increased attention; and preachers will have to be very careful that they do not misconstrue the passages which they cite from their recollection of the Authorised Text. It seems to me that we should encourage our people to bring the Revised Version with them to church, and also to make some use of it at family worship and at meetings of Sunday-school teachers.

Let us not be alarmed at the unsettling of men's minds. What is taken for strong attachment to the old English Bible is often a mere apathetic and unintelligent confidence in one form of words, and there is no reason why this should not be disturbed. Indeed, it is high time that every one were made to understand that the Bible is neither this version nor that, but the collection of original documents, which reaches modern nations only through many transcriptions and various translations; and that it is due to the truth, to ourselves and our children, to seek for the purest text and the most faithful version that the best scholarship can produce.

We should take care lest, by a cold or ungracious reception of the Revised New Testament, we impede or discourage the Old Testament Company in their arduous task. Of the two branches of this great undertaking, theirs is the more necessary. By the help of recent critical editions of the New Testament in English, and the instructions of an educated ministry, many persons have known nearly all the corrections of the Revision lately published, even without reading

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

Greek. But large portions of the Old Testament are at present of little service to English readers, because of unskilful translation and the want of those historical annotations which are found so necessary to the interpretation of other ancient books. The company of revisers may not have it within their province to annotate, but at all events they will confer an immense boon on the Church and the family in all English-speaking countries, if they will remove obscurities and indelicacies of expression, which have long been matter of regret.

LONDON, 13th June, 1881.

D. FRASER.

III.

1. In any utterance by ministers of the Gospel on the Revised Version, the keynote should be one of thankfulness. And this, not for the Revision alone, but also for what its publication has brought to light. For, almost on the same day, two good things were made public—the New Version itself, and the immense breadth of Christian life which showed itself prepared to welcome it. Over the length and breadth of England and America, Christian life, with a glad eagerness and multitudinousness which has surprised even its possessors, has sprung up to welcome this Revised Version of the New Testament.

2. Readers of Gausson's book on the "Canon of Scripture" will remember that remarkable chapter in which he adduces the preservation of the Old Testament as an evidence of its having come from God. Something of the same evidential value belongs to the remarkable history of the English Bible. What rational explanation can be given of the life of John Tyndale, whose peculiar genius has been felt to breathe through all the versions of the New Testament since his own, except the explanation that he was a man raised up by God for this work, set apart from his birth, and inspired by the Spirit of God? Is there a single minister of the Gospel who has been handling the Word in its English dress for any length of time, who has not found himself, since the Revised Version has come into his possession, recalling, with moist eyes, the old story of that martyr's achievements and sufferings? What a life it was of heroic endeavour, of self-sacrifice, of adventure! And with what a pathos of persistency, in the face of cruel persecutions and misrepresentations, he went forward with his work!—a worker utterly discouraged of man, who had to stay himself up, in exile and in prison, and at last at the stake, on the Lord alone. We have come a long way since that 6th of October, 1536, when Tyndale was led out of the castle prison of Vilvorde, near Antwerp, in rags and chains, to die. We have seen the seventy years' fervour of translation which followed in England—the fruit of his labours. We have seen the Authorised Version winning its way into the national heart, and speaking to generation after generation the message of God, for two hundred and seventy years without a rival. And now in these days we have received the latest, ripest labour of translation—this New Version of the New Testament—the work of the best scholarship of our generation, or, so far as England is concerned, of any generation; the work of men who, that the work might be well done, sank the memory of their ecclesiastical differences, and for the Word's sake, and for the sake of Him whose Word it is, spent ten long years in an earnest labour of love. He who cannot see God in this history is surely blind. That God's hand and Spirit are visible in it will be acknowledged thankfully by all lovers of the Word.

3. Perhaps the next matter for thankfulness is the demonstration, afforded by

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

the publication of the Revised Version, of the energetic, formative power of the Word. I am thinking, as I write this, of that great passage in the thirteenth of First Corinthians, over which there has been such a cry of regret. "Each time I read that marvellous episode," says one of our greatest scholars, "I feel with increased force the inimitable delicacy, and beauty, and sublimity of the rendering, till I begin to doubt whether the English language is not a better vehicle than even the Greek for so lofty a theme." Yet I suppose it will be conceded on every hand that 'charity' was not the word the early translators should have used. Every way, then, it was a poorer word than 'love.' And it is poorer still. But it has become, by its connection with this passage, purged and spiritualised. The thought it was taken to express has lifted it up to a height equal with its own, until now, so entirely has it been leavened and glorified by that thought, that we are touched with a natural regret to find it in the old place no longer. I cite this instance, however, not to put any emphasis on this regret. I am glad the revisers had the courage to put the right word in the right place. I cite this instance only as an illustration of the leavening and purifying power of the original. What it did for the word 'charity' it has been doing for thousands of other words, and for thought, and work, and life. And what comes to us in this new version is—not in one paragraph only, but throughout—a closer contact with the thought of God, and, in that, a greater subjection of our lives to its formative and elevating power.

4. It is matter for great thankfulness that the preacher, after the New Version shall have established itself in the pulpit, will require so seldom to spend precious time in telling hearers who know nothing of Greek, what the original says more, or less, or other than the translation does. And better still, the changes made in the New Version will show, more grandly than explanation of the preacher could, the largeness, the breadth, the spirituality, and the glorious fulness and unity of the Gospel. If here and there proof-texts in old controversies shall seem to have disappeared, texts germinative and suggestive, texts showing new and larger aspects of the old truth, texts with new powers of the kingdom in them, shall be found to have come into their place.

5. It is still thankfulness I mainly feel when asking myself, To what uses the present version and interest in it are to be put?

There can be but one counsel. It is the counsel to make the New Testament more than ever a household book, and a life-long study. It is a great thing, a great gift from God, to have a version which brings the common reader—such a reader as the ploughboy for whom Tyndale laboured—nearer to the very form of the thoughts of God. It is a great thing for future conflicts to have the sword of the Word as nakedly as in a translation it can be.

No right-hearted minister will speak otherwise than thankfully of this great service done for us all by the revisers; but each will strive to use this great translation, and the truly great occasion it brings to us, and the new powers of the truth it places in our hands, to revive an interest in the Word itself, and to reassert the old truths in their new and happier settings.

ALEXANDER MACLEOD.

BIRKENHEAD, 14th June, 1881.

IV.

THE Revised Version of the New Testament marks an era in Bible circulation, and the wonderful demand for early copies, on both sides of the Atlantic, shows the hold which, above all other books, Scripture has upon the hearts and minds of men. In Scotland we have been particularly interested in its appearance, and intensely critical in our study of its renderings. How best to utilise this interest and criticism is a problem that calls for the help of the religious press and the Christian people. The attention which has been turned to the Sacred Volume furnishes an opportunity which wise men will seek to improve.

The question is pressed, whether the New should not at once be substituted for the Old Version in the services of the churches. My view is that, in the meantime, such a substitution would be rash and premature. We have not yet had time to form a mature estimate of the changes introduced by the revisers. These learned men have for ten years been engaged in the great work to which they were called. Their labours were all that time private and confidential. The changes which, by a majority of votes, or unanimously, they have introduced, have been in our hands for a few weeks only, and even scholars must have time to weigh the arguments which led to the decisions reached. The great body of Bible readers are not scholars, but very many of them can appreciate the arguments of scholars, and every change warranted by sound reasons will be accepted and welcomed by all who desire to understand what they read. Such reasons, however, the revisers do not supply. We have the results, but not the processes of their labour. These will become apparent by-and-by, when members of the Revision Committee and others who have made New Testament Greek a special study, have had time to defend or to impugn the new renderings. If the changes introduced are real emendations, they will win their way to recognition; if they are uncalled for, this age of incisive criticism will not tolerate their retention. We can afford to wait for the recognition of the New Version. We know what we have. The Authorised Version has been tested. We have abundant proof of its efficacy and sufficiency; and while hailing the Revised Version as a boon to individual Christians and to the Churches, we wish to prove the work as a whole before we give it the first place in our regard.

But while of opinion that it would be unwise to supplant the Old by the New Version, I would by no means leave the New to make its way unaided. It ought to be constantly on the study table, and it should be quoted and referred to by ministers in expository work. They should explain to their people the grounds on which the revision was undertaken, and where the new renderings are a clear gain to the English reader, this should at once be admitted. In lecturing upon large passages of Scripture—a good old Scottish custom, too much lost sight of in modern days—the Revised Version of the New Testament will give valuable aid. By thus directing public attention to the value of the work as an aid to Bible study, ministers will do more to commend it than by at once displacing the Old Version and making the New their standard. Regard must be had in this matter to the habits and traditions of the older members of the churches. To them, the rhythms and cadences of the Authorised Version give pleasure such as the Jew found in the stones of Zion. Its renderings constitute their oldest memories and mingle with their most hallowed associations. For their sakes, the old pulpit Bibles must not be hastily removed. By-and-by, when new generations arise

CATHOLIC
who a
easy
recogn
gress
Ind
more
Believ
regret
someti
introd
Prayer
in the
given
uncall
minds
The A
these
from t
chang
ought
inter
the d
new i
be a g
spirit
who v
in rea
search

GLAS

INT
revele
prefer
aband
though
system
our g
ing to
engag
from
Prote
after
move
the v
Self-i
allian

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

who are familiar with the New Version, the substitution will be natural and easy. King James's translation took fifty years to win its way to universal recognition. We must not move too quickly, else we shall really hinder the progress of the New Revision.

Indications are not wanting that the work may make way in public favour more slowly than the eagerness with which it was hailed seemed to promise. Believing it to be on the whole the best English version of the sacred text, I regret that a reaction against it seems to have set in. Newspaper criticism, sometimes rash and hasty in its judgments, has condemned many of the changes introduced by the Committee. The omission of the doxology from the Lord's Prayer; the changes in the angels' song; the substitution of "love" for charity in the thirteenth chapter of 1st Corinthians, and other marked alterations have given a shock to the religious sentiments of many, and are regarded by others as uncalled for. In questions which must be decided by differently constituted minds on evidence that is not conclusive, there cannot be unanimity of judgment. The American Committee sometimes differed from their British colleagues, and these occasionally differed among themselves. But such differences, inseparable from the undertaking, do not detract from the value of the work. That all the changes introduced into the volume do not commend themselves to every one, ought not to prejudice readers against the version as a whole, or to lessen the interest with which it is regarded. Now that the revisers' task is finished, it is the duty of the Churches and the Christian people to make diligent use of the new instrument with which God in His providence has furnished them. It will be a great misfortune if the friends of the Bible do not take advantage of the spirit of inquiry which is abroad, and combine to direct the investigations of those who wish to know exactly what the Scriptures teach. The New Version is never in real conflict with the Old, and neither has cause to fear the ordeal of fiery searching criticism.

JAMES DODDS.

GLASGOW, 14th June, 1881.

NOTES OF THE DAY.

INTERNATIONAL VICE.—Much attention and indignation have been excited by revelations of a horrible traffic, in which English girls have been lured, on false pretences, to Brussels and other continental cities, immured in dens of infamy, and abandoned in utter helplessness to lives of degradation and misery too awful to be thought of. It is well that at last daylight has been let in upon this fearful system, and a warning given that cannot be without effect. We are thankful to our good friend, M. Anet, of Brussels, and others, for their valuable aid in bringing to punishment the guilty wretches who have degraded their humanity by engaging in this traffic. One lesson, in the line of our work, we may surely draw from these transactions—the especial value of such men as M. Anet, with his Protestant sympathies and friendships, in such countries as Belgium, in looking after fellow Protestants from other lands. Such men are much more readily moved to take up such cases, and probe them to the bottom. We may see, too, the value of such Homes as that of Miss Leigh in Paris, for English women. Self-interest, as well as higher motives, may well move the larger Churches to close alliance with the Evangelical Churches and labourers in foreign lands.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

IRISH TREASON IN AMERICA.—A thrill of horror has been sent through this country by some extracts from articles published in his New York journal by Mr. O'Donovan Rossa, a Fenian centre. "We are to have measure for measure," he says, "blood for blood. Two verdicts for murder have lately been recorded against the English Government in Ireland; and we would heartily rejoice this day if a telegraph flashed across the news that some two Irishmen had executed that sentence on Buckshot Forster and Hypocrite Gladstone." We have no doubt that every American of sound mind and morals who reads these words must feel the same horror as ourselves. Does the instigation of murder against members of a friendly nation constitute no indictable offence in the United States? We can hardly imagine that any American Christian can breathe freely if such odious words are printed and circulated with impunity in his country.

LOCAL OPTION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Again Sir Wilfrid Lawson has introduced his resolution in favour of local option in the granting of licenses. It has been carried this time by a larger majority than last, and in a smaller house, indicating that many who voted against it last year have abstained from doing so now. It is much to be regretted that a second year of the present Parliament should do no more than pass an abstract resolution. But legislation has been so impeded by Irish business that in other departments it is almost at a stand-still. There is considerable difference of opinion as to what local option means. Certainly the matter is left in a somewhat vague form, and it is desirable to know what amount of restriction Parliament is disposed to allow. Though in a sense unsatisfactory, it is admitted that the present suspense is in favour of the more rigid measures of restriction. Opinion is running strongly in the direction of temperance, and the longer a legislative measure is delayed, the greater seems the likelihood of carrying one with somewhat drastic provisions. On the other hand, while the present system remains unchecked, the evils attending it continue unabated.

THE BOHEMIAN COMMEMORATION.—Messrs. Cisar and Caspar, from Moravia and Bohemia, have been in Britain, addressing the supreme courts of the Presbyterian Churches, and otherwise creating an interest in the Bohemian cause. Their addresses have been full of interest, and wherever they have been heard, they have made a deep impression. But only a few have heard them, and we fear that there prevails generally a very great ignorance of the marvellous history of the Bohemian Church. Means ought to be taken for circulating a popular account of the history, testimony, persecutions, and revival of the Bohemian Protestants, and thus preparing the way to render them substantial help. It does prosperous churches much good to become familiar with the struggles unto death and unspeakable hardships, nobly borne, that have fallen to the lot of their sister-churches. We hope the various churches will send good men and true to take part in the centenary commemoration—men of heart and soul, who, when they come back, will fire their own churches and countrymen, and give rise to a worthy tribute to the land of Huss and Jerome.

CASE OF MR. STRONG, OF MELBOURNE.—Some progress has been made in this case, adverted to in our last number. The Committee appointed by the Presbytery to examine Mr. Strong's article on the Atonement in the *Victorian Review*, has reported, and has specified eighteen points to which they deem it necessary that the attention of the Presbytery should be drawn. In addition to these, they give four particulars in which the views contained in the *Review* appear to be unsatisfactory. The most important of these is, that the article appears to leave out the essential element of atonement—viz., the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ. The report, though laid on the table, was not discussed, but another meeting was appointed to be held a week later, to afford Mr. Strong an opportunity of explaining the objectionable statements, if he was disposed to do so.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

AMERICAN NOTES.

GENERAL ASSEMBLIES—E PLURIBUS UNUM—FAIR GIVEN UP—MAY MEETINGS—
TEMPERANCE—COLOURED VOTERS—BREWERS.

In the midst of the General Assemblies I write these lines, and if they are superseded by later intelligence before you go to press, you will throw them aside.

And this leads me to say that the telegraph has made the letter-writer almost superfluous. What a man now writes to be read across the ocean, becomes "stale, flat, and unprofitable," and if printed, the disgusted reader cries out, "Old news."

The (Northern) General Assembly met at Buffalo, N.Y., not far from the Falls of Niagara. Dr. Raffles, of Liverpool, said to me on his door-step, "I want to go to America for two reasons: to see the Niagara Falls and Dr. Sprague's autographs." But he died without the sight of either. It is easy to believe that if our brethren from over the water were at the Assembly, they would enjoy the Falls quite as much as the *proceedings*.

The Rev. Dr. Paxton, of New York, whose sermon at the opening of the Presbyterian General Council in Philadelphia you heard, being the last Moderator of the Assembly, preached at the opening of this, and then the Assembly organised by the election of the Rev. Dr. Henry Darling, of Albany, as Moderator. About 500 ministers and elders were in attendance. This number will not appear large in Scotland, where your ecclesiastical bodies are often more numerous attended. Yet our American Presbyterians have been frightened by the size of their own body, and have made repeated and resolute efforts to reduce the representation. Happily, all such efforts have been defeated by the good sense of the Presbyteries, which invariably reject the overtures sent down for their ratification of the necessary alterations in the constitution of the Church.

A very important change in the Synods has just been sanctioned by the Presbyteries; and the Synods will hereafter be representative bodies from the Presbyteries, if they so prefer, and will be the final court for the trial of judicial cases, except where the doctrine of the Church is involved. This will increase the power and usefulness of the Synod, and will greatly relieve the Assembly.

The (Southern) General Assembly met at Staunton, Virginia, a city situated in a region of country of marvellous beauty: the great valley, the picturesque mountains, and the natural bridge, a world-wonder, are all to be enjoyed by those visiting this Assembly. About 150 commissioners were present, representing the Church in all the Southern States. The opening sermon was preached by Rev. T. A. Hoyt, D.D., of Nashville, the retiring Moderator, and Rev. Dr. R. P. Farris, of St. Louis, was elected Moderator for the ensuing year.

The fifty-first General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church met in Austin, Texas. The opening sermon was delivered by the Rev. W. G. Templeton, of Fayette, Tenn. 170 delegates were present. Rev. J. W. Darby, of Evansville, Md., was elected Moderator. This (Southern) Presbyterian Church is making solid and permanent progress, as the country recuperates and advances. The question of reunion with the Northern body is no longer a subject of discussion. Harmony of feeling and action is in large measure restored. And if the whole Presbyterian family in the United States were *now* to be united into one organic whole, the time would also have arrived to divide that whole into at least three geographical sections. It would be a good thing to do. If all the Presbyterians in the South would come into one body, and all the North into another, and all in the West into a Great Western Assembly; and these three were to combine in one General Assembly Meeting once in three or four years, for missionary work at home and abroad, the power of the denomination in the United States would be vastly augmented. The reunion of these branches

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

in the Philadelphia General Council has a happy effect on them all, and this "better feeling" may yet bring forth fruit to the good of the Church, and to the honour of Christ, its Head.

When we were discussing at Philadelphia the expediency of meeting at Belfast in 1884, it was said that an International Fair was anticipated in New York in 1883, and this was given as a reason why the next General Council should not be held in that year. Now it is probable that no such Fair will be held in New York. The people did not respond to the proposal. And it is understood that the promoters have abandoned the project. It is quite as well that the Council has adjourned until 1884. Perhaps an interval of four or even five years is better than three.

Our May Meetings, the anniversaries of our national benevolent and philanthropic societies, have ceased to be of popular and commanding interest. Nobody knows why. The contributions do not fall off; in some cases they increase. The usefulness of these institutions is as great as ever. But our "anniversaries," that formerly were great centres of religious attraction, drawing Christians to New York as to a feast in Jerusalem, are now only a name. This decline has been going on for several years, and this year the interest in them has been so feeble as to raise the question whether it is worth while to keep them up. If they live, it will be a lingering, dying life.

The State of North Carolina has recently taken a new departure in the matter of temperance in drinking, and a very curious feature has just appeared. A law has been enacted by both Houses of the Legislature, and has received the official sanction of the Governor, which provides for the PROHIBITION of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks. But this law is to come into operation only after it receives the approbation of a majority of the legal voters in the State. To test this question, a special election is to be held on the fourth day of August next. Now for the singular feature. The Rev. Dr. Skinner, of North Carolina, stated, at a public meeting in New York, that if the law is not approved by a majority, it will be because the coloured people will vote against it! He said that the blacks, old enough to be voters, are very largely unable to read. Consequently, they cannot be reached by printed facts, arguments, and appeals; and are at the mercy of demagogues, who go among them with inflammatory harangues, making them believe that this new law is to deprive them of their liberty. They demand their whisky, and will vote against a temperance measure. Both of the great political parties in the State have furnished the men who made the new law; but there are men in both parties who are opposed to temperance laws, and if they can get the coloured people to go with them *en masse*, the law will fail.

It would be a great calamity if the legislation that promises to be so advantageous to the coloured race as well as the white, should be defeated by the votes of these people. But the fear of it will give you, on the other side of the ocean, a vivid idea of the dangers to which we are exposed where universal suffrage prevails and education does not keep up with it. We have sent some money to aid in paying itinerant lecturers to enlighten the coloured people as to their duty and their true interests in this matter, and I earnestly hope that the State may be triumphantly saved, and its goings established on the rock of prohibition.

The brewers of the Union have become alarmed at the progress of temperance, and, in a general convention at Chicago, have voted to print and circulate tracts, &c., to counteract what they are pleased to call modern fanaticism. This is a good sign. Certainly it shows that the temperance cause is making itself felt in the very heart of the enemy. If the brewers are afraid of it, the friends may take courage. Every year increases the evidence that intemperance is the great scourge of society, the parent of poverty, misery, and crime. Legislation, wise and firm, is to be invoked to diminish the evil.

The General Council has taken steps tending toward co-operation in the work of Christian missions in pagan countries. Is it not wise and well to push this

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

project with all prudent energy? Is there not intelligence and charity in the Presbyterian family adequate to the Catholic Presbyterianism that would be exhibited if all of that name in any one country were in one organisation for Christian work? There is no insurmountable difficulty in the way of making a missionary agency that shall, from one point, direct all the operations of Presbyterian evangelisation in the whole earth. The result of such union or combination would be immense economy of force, especially of money power, and the establishment in foreign lands of a homogeneous body of Christians in place of the diversities that now prevail.

There is no end to the generosity of our Philadelphia brethren in matters and things pertaining to the late Council. That Council *voted* that a copy of the volume containing its proceedings should be sent to every contributor of a paper, and to every theological seminary represented in it! But the Council forgot to back up its resolution by the money to pay for the books. The Philadelphia brethren sent the books, nearly a thousand, and paid the bill! That was right, and just like them.

S. IRENAUS PRIME.

GENERAL SURVEY.

SCOTLAND.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

THE General Assembly of the Established Church met in Edinburgh on the 19th of May. The Rev. Dr. Smith, of Cathcart, a venerable minister who has served the Church for more than half-a-century, was chosen Moderator.

The reports on the various Missions were fairly satisfactory. The Home Mission, with a revenue of £16,000, has 51 mission stations with 1944 communicants, and 77 mission congregations with 10,000 communicants. Eleven new parishes have been endowed during the year. The amount received last year for the General Endowment Scheme was upwards of £18,000. The Jewish Mission has had a favourable year on the whole, and a larger number of baptisms than ever before. The Colonial Mission, which was in difficulties, has, by a large legacy and by retrenchment, got its feet cleared. The Foreign Mission led to a good deal of keen discussion. Some members of Assembly spoke pretty severely of the Committee, both with respect to the Blantyre case and in regard to its management generally. The income for the year was £16,600, the expenditure a little over that. It was stated that there must either be an abandoning of stations or a doubling of the present income. Steps towards an increase are to be taken.

The now famous "Scotch Sermons" came under the notice of the Assembly in connection with the Lenzie case. After hearing parties at the bar, the Rev. Dr. Cunningham, of Crieff, himself one of the writers, moved the Assembly to find that there was nothing erroneous in Mr. M'Farlane's teaching, but that his sermon on "Things which cannot be shaken" is liable to be misunderstood, and fitted to create alarm in many minds; and that Mr. M'Farlane should receive a caution to exercise greater carefulness, whether in preaching or in publishing. A motion of a considerably different kind was made by Professor Flint, stating that, *ex facie*, in both sermons (Mr. M'Farlane had contributed two sermons to the volume) there were unedifying and erroneous statements; that more particularly the second sermon—the one referred to by Dr. Cunningham—is blameworthy, because, in stating some modern sceptical views, its author does not make it clear whether or not he himself accepts them, and because, among the things

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

which cannot be shaken, the great evangelical verities have no place; but that, if Mr. M'Farlane shall disclaim the erroneous statements referred to, express regret for the doubts he has created as to his soundness, and promise to be more careful in the future, the matter should take end with an admonition. The second motion was carried by 230 to 61. Thereupon Mr. M'Farlane was asked if he had any explanations to make. He requested time for consideration. Next day he appeared at the Assembly's bar, and stated that, instead of intending to identify himself with the objections of sceptical writers, he brought their objections forward to meet them, and he assured the Assembly that in his preaching he gave their proper place to the central truths of our Lord's divinity and His mediatorship. The Assembly accepted the statement as satisfactory, and the case took end with a gentle admonition from the Moderator.

The report on "Christian Life and Work" gave rise to an interesting discussion. In moving its approval, the Rev. Mr. M'Leod, of Govan, gave utterance to some views not quite acceptable to men of the older school. The report had made some suggestions as to how week-day religious services might be made more interesting; but Mr. M'Leod thought that, instead of trying to make more of the ordinary prayer meeting, which seemed to be what was meant, something much more satisfactory would be accomplished by keeping the churches always open, that people might use them on any day and at any time for their devotions. Mr. M'Leod also expressed the desirability of making much more of the Sacraments than was usual in Scotland; and he had some theories in regard to an efficient parochial staff which did not seem to be fully explained. Principal Pirie and Dr. Phin both took strong exception to the remarks of the minister of Govan, while Dr. Story supported him.

FREE CHURCH ASSEMBLY.

THE Rev. Dr. Laughton, a highly-esteemed Greenock minister, was chosen Moderator. He was nominated to the office by his predecessor, the Rev. Dr. Main, Edinburgh, who was seized with illness immediately after, and, before the Assembly rose, was called to be with the Lord whom he had devotedly and successfully served for more than forty years.

The great interest of the Assembly centred in the Smith case. On three different days and in three different forms it was discussed. First of all, there was a question respecting the proceedings of the Commission of last year. The Commission may be described as a Committee of the whole Assembly, appointed every year, at the close of the Assembly's sittings, by which that body in some sort continues its existence till its successor has been elected and convened. The Commission has three ordinary meetings—in August, November, and March—but may be called together at any time. Its powers are limited and carefully defined; but its special duty to advert to matters concerning the general interests of the Church, that these may suffer no injury, puts a large discretion into its hands. This Court, on the publication by Professor Smith of an article on "Hebrew Literature," written when the libel against him was still proceeding, and not known to the Assembly of 1880, when it restored him to his professorial position under certain admonitions, thought itself called upon to interfere, and instructed Mr. Smith to abstain from teaching his class till the succeeding Assembly should deal with the matter. This proceeding gave rise to not a little excitement over the Church. Many thought it unconstitutional, and strong views were expressed. After a long discussion in the Assembly, the action of the Commission was sustained by a majority of about two to one. Next day Principal Rainy moved, in substance, that having reference to the circumstances in which the article on "Hebrew Literature" was published, as also to its tone and the character of some of its statements "tending to throw grave doubt on the historical truth and Divine inspiration of several books of Scripture," Professor Smith had lost the confidence of the Church, and ought no longer to be entrusted with the training of students for the ministry. In opposition to this motion, the Rev. Dr. Whyte,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

Free St. George's, Edinburgh, moved that a Committee should be appointed "to consider the writings of Professor Smith published since last Assembly," with power, if they saw cause, to libel him before the Presbytery of Aberdeen, and in any case to report to next Assembly. Dr. Rainy's motion was carried by a majority of 423 to 265. Then, last of all, this no-confidence vote was followed up on a subsequent day, when, by 394 to 231, Professor Smith was formally removed from his chair at Aberdeen and the ecclesiastical rights therewith connected, it being left for the Church's further consideration whether any or what action should be taken in regard to the volume of Lectures recently published, and which there has not been sufficient time to consider.

The report in regard to the annual contributions was satisfactory. For all purposes, the total amount was £590,000, only £1000 less than last year, the highest ever reached. In "Foreign Missions" it was intimated that there was an increase of nearly £9000—the whole sum raised being £47,000. If we add to this the contributions given for the Jewish, Colonial, and Continental Missions, that sum will be considerably increased.

IRELAND.

MEETING OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

By Rev. Dr. KNOX, *Belfast*.

It is ten years since the Supreme Court of the Irish Presbyterian Church met in the metropolis of the country; and not in the memory of living men was the country in such a condition of unrest. Reports come in daily, from the south and west, of turbulence and resistance to law. The preparations made by the Government would indicate their apprehension that there is more danger than what even appears on the surface. The *national* papers, as they are called, are filled with the most inflammable material; and the language of irresponsible agitators was never more violent. What was intended as a remedial measure to the oppressed and impoverished tenantry is not regarded with any favour by the extreme section of the so-called national party. In fact, they seem to feel that if the Land Bill now before Parliament be passed into law, their occupation is gone. They fear that, having obtained such a boon, the people may settle down peacefully to the cultivation of the soil, and that their dream of dismembering the empire must perish. The Presbyterian people (and their ministers) almost unanimously sympathise with the popular claims for redress; but they abhor and denounce acts of violence, and seek to obtain their just rights by constitutional means. The more excitable and less reflecting, and, I may add, less loyal of the Irish people in the southern portion of the country are impatient of all delay, and clamour for what no constitutional government can ever grant.

It was under these circumstances that the Assembly met in Ireland's excitable capital on the 6th of June. The church in which the opening services were conducted is a very handsome one, and was the gift of the late Alex. Findlater.

Rev. Dr. Fleming Stevenson, so well known and esteemed in *all the Churches*, was unanimously called to the chair; and the judgment and ability which he has displayed fully justifies the choice of the Assembly. His opening address was distinguished by fervid eloquence, by genuine and high-toned patriotism, and loyal attachment to the Church of his fathers. The Assembly with great heartiness adopted a resolution to present a loyal address to the Queen. This was unusual, but perhaps was called for in the present condition of the country.

The preliminary business was routine, dealing with the reports of presbyteries, and yet even in them there was much to excite solemn thought, from the number of deaths and resignations announced. The usual reports on "the state of religion," "Sabbath observance," and temperance were full of interest. An exhaustive sheet of statistics was laid on the table, showing a continuous diminution of the population, and yet that the funds of all the schemes of the Church

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

have been on the whole well sustained. The Assembly was favoured by the presence of a strong deputation from the English Presbyterian Church, and also from the Welsh Church. These eminent brethren received a right royal and Irish welcome.

The Presbyterian people of Dublin overwhelmed the members of Assembly with noble hospitality, as has been the custom for the last ten years. The great interest centred in the *music* question. The opponents of instrumental aid were exasperated by the action of one congregation, which, at the very time when earnest efforts were being made to give up the use of harmoniums, actually introduced an organ, and altered the structure of their church for its accommodation. This had a decided influence on the general feeling, and likewise on the vote arrived at. By a majority of 21 in a full house, this congregation was enjoined to give up the organ, and the presbytery was instructed to see that this be done. Against this a large number entered a protest. The majority proceeded to order the removal of the harmonium out of four other churches. This was carried by a still greater majority, a large number of brethren preferring "nature's sweet restorer, balmy sleep," to the renewal of a fiery discussion. Some others of what are called instrumentalists declare their determination to abide as they are. What the issue may be it is hard to predict. The Assembly is committed to a distinct determination, and in the opinion of some, resistance on the part of any involves discipline. The excitement in favour of liberty in this matter is intense, and will find vent in a vigorous agitation. In this direction, steps were immediately taken by the preparation of an overture to be laid on the table of the present Assembly, *claiming liberty* for individual congregations. And now the question will be no longer tried on any side issue or as a matter of ecclesiastical authority, but on its *merits*. A large number of ministers and people deplore this root of bitterness, and heartily desire that it were taken out of the way, that all the energies of the Church may be devoted to its grand mission—*evangelisation of Ireland*. It remains to be seen what form discipline may take, and what shall be the fruit of a year's agitation. I suppose Ireland must always have a burning question—pity it had not one more worthy its attention. This year, a new scheme, called "The Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund," was launched with great enthusiasm and success. The Messrs. Sinclair of New York, who are among the noblest of the *Scoto-Irish* in that country, struck the key-note by a subscription of £2500. Two others of £1000 each quickly followed. The scheme is thus fairly started, and is already beyond risk of failure.

Great anxiety was felt for months past in regard to matters arising out of our Foreign Mission. A large commission was appointed to investigate this matter, and after the most thorough sifting of the whole case, that commission brought in a finding which was acceded to by all parties, and was unanimously accepted by the Assembly. This was the occasion of special satisfaction, and the Assembly was called on to express devout thankfulness to God, in His gracious leading to such an issue. A conference was held by a number of ministers and laymen interested in *colportage*, with the view of stimulating and extending an agency specially adapted to the present condition of the country. Several hours were devoted by the Assembly to a conference in private as to the spiritual condition of Ireland, and the prospects of its evangelisation. It was the uniform testimony of brethren in the home mission-field that the scattered Protestant population under their care deserve the deepest sympathy in the present unsettled state of the country. They spoke hopefully, at the same time, of openings for the Gospel among the Roman Catholic population. The agitation on the land question is liberating and emancipating the minds of the Catholic laity, and setting them free to think *independently* on more subjects than the land laws. In point of fact there is no class—not even the landlords,—who regard the present agitation with more feverish anxiety than the Irish priests. They are willing, and ever have been, to cast in their lot with a poor and oppressed people, but a free and independent people they cannot away with.

CATH

MAY
HOTHE
Britis
green
seems
aside
Chur
meet
inter
in the
the dTh
eveni
which
publi
"vue
Presb
Chris
select
beforTh
Fran
seeki
necte
attra
of a
mem
Colig
have
to e
were
since
succ
rema
grou
unde
obta
prou
III,
prea
We
figur
hear
we v
T
time
oper
true
It is
in g

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

FRANCE.

By Rev. H. J. WHEATCROFT, B.D., *Orleans.*

MAY MEETINGS—HISTORICAL PROTESTANT SOCIETY—PROPOSED STATUE TO COLIGNY—HOME AND FOREIGN MISSIONS—SYNOD OF III. CIRCONSCRIPTION—NEW BOOKS.

THE French Reformed Church has for many years followed the time-honoured British custom of May meetings. Paris in May looks its best, with its fresh green Boulevards, its sparkling fountains and general brilliancy; it, therefore, seems quite natural that this month should have been, by common consent, set aside for these large religious gatherings. The members of the Evangelical Churches from all parts of France—Methodists, Lutherans, and Presbyterians—meet in friendly converse at the “conférences générales,” there to discuss the most interesting ecclesiastical and theological topics of the day; these congresses being in themselves an eloquent proof of the vitality of the Evangelical Alliance amongst the different Reformed confessions of this country.

The mornings and afternoons are generally devoted to these discussions; the evenings are taken up by the annual meetings of the various religious societies, at which reports of the work done by them during the past year are presented to the public. I shall not dwell at length on the proceedings of these societies. In a “vue d'ensemble,” which was inserted in the March number of *The Catholic Presbyterian*, I have already described the working and results of the different Christian agencies of our Church, and to this I refer our readers. Still, I shall select certain points of interest special to the last twelve months, and lay them before our British and American friends.

The first meeting was that of the “Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français.” This Society has, during the last twenty years, devoted its energies to seeking for and publishing documents of all kinds, both public and private, connected with the past history of the French Reformed Church. The principal attraction of this *séance* was the discourse of Pasteur Bersier on the realisation of a long-desired project, viz.—a statue being erected at Paris to the memory of the most illustrious victim of the St. Bartholomew, Admiral Coligny. For several years, Mr. Bersier and others of our leading men have been striving to obtain from the Government the authorisation necessary to erect a monument to the great Huguenot chief and martyr. They were unsuccessful as long as the clerical party was in the ascendant; but since the prevalence of more liberal ideas among the ruling powers, their hopes of success have brightened into certainty. It was at first decided that the mortal remains now lying in shameful neglect in a small village of central France, in the grounds of an ultra-Romanist baron, should be transferred to Paris and interred under the monument. But the permission demanded from M. de — was not obtained. Still, members of the Reformed Church may well be thankful and proud, that opposite the Louvre, where are the statues of Charles IX. and Henry III., and behind the chancel of our Eglise de l'Oratoire, where Bossuet once preached to Louis XIV. and his court, a memorial of Coligny will soon be erected. We would add, in the words of Pasteur Bersier, “It is right that opposite the figures of the royal murderers should be reared that of their noble and true-hearted victim. When it shall be standing under the shadow of our old ‘Temple’ we will show it to our children and say, ‘He was the greatest of the Huguenots!’”

The Home Mission Societies were able this year, more than at any preceding time, to join in prayers of thankfulness for great mercies. New fields seem to be opening in all directions, and the cry is for more faithful labourers inspired with true zeal for evangelisation, and greater material resources to carry on the work. It is one of the most hopeful symptoms of the present movement that it springs in great part, not only from antagonism against the Romish priesthood, but also

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

from the real craving of the human soul for the satisfaction of its spiritual wants. Another encouraging feature is the fact, that some of our best home workers are laymen, whose influence for pioneering work among the anti-clerical and unbelieving masses is generally greater at first than that of ministers, their official character being a stumbling-block to some. It is on ground thus broken by our lay-lecturers that the pastoral work, properly so called, is carried on.

The area of our foreign missions is also being gradually extended in Africa and the Pacific. Mr. Coillard, the most recent explorer of the Zambesi, earnestly desired to found a new mission on the banks of that great African river. His energy has succeeded in arousing the attention and enlisting the sympathy of our Churches in this cause, and he has succeeded in finding both the future fellow-labourers and the financial resources necessary for this grand and, humanly speaking, venturesome undertaking. This year, also, our mission board has had the satisfaction of seeing the translation of the Bible into the Basuto language completed, Mr. Mabille (whose acquaintance many of our readers made at Philadelphia) being now in Europe to direct the printing, which is carried on under the auspices of the British and Foreign Bible Society. The importance of this work for the religious future of the "dark continent" cannot be overestimated, as, by a providential coincidence, the Basuto tongue is spoken by considerable tribes on the Zambesi, it being thus a natural vehicle for the promotion of Gospel knowledge in Central Africa. It was with infinite thankfulness that the friends of missions in our Church met together this year. Twelve months ago, clouds were gathering over Basutoland; now, peace has replaced war, and hopes may be rationally entertained that, through trial, the faith of our native brethren will have grown stronger and purer. Events have shown how true were the surmises of our missionaries with regard to the ultimate issue.

I would now draw attention to an event of some importance as regards the reconstitution of our Church: I refer to the meeting of the Synod of the Third Circoscription, composed of five *consistoires* (presbyteries). This Synod is the most important of all the provincial assemblies, as it comprises the Paris Presbytery. Notwithstanding some inexperience, it was characterised by much goodwill and energy, several practical measures being decided on, as, for instance, a small augmentation to the ministers' stipend, and the nomination of delegates to visit churches in the name of the Synod. There is one point which, I think, may seem of peculiar interest to other Presbyterian communities. It was proposed, under the inspiration of one of the most honoured and beloved professors of our Montauban College, that a motion should be sent up to the "Synod General" (which, *D.V.*, will meet next October at Marseilles) in the following terms:—"That the Synod General be pleased to inscribe among questions to be examined the following:—Is it desirable and advisable that preliminary studies should be carried on among the Churches connected with the universal Presbyterian Alliance, to the end that a confession of faith common to all these Churches be promulgated?" It was my privilege to put forward this proposition, which was unanimously carried. The French Reformed Church, owing, I believe, to her ignorance of what takes place in the Anglo-Saxon world, has not yet fully appreciated the excellency of the Presbyterian Alliance; but we have reason to think that the religious mind in the Reformed Church is awakening to a sense of its advantages. It is essential that the Alliance should be kept before the ecclesiastical mind, and the discussion in our General Assembly will do much for this purpose.

THE
into p
have
them
of fe
viole
easy
deep
feren
well
the p
Besic
vario
to ou
Or
Jewi
of th
tion
Dr.
and
state
Jewi
upon
the
auct
unde
prop
is of
half
of h
T
255,
feeli
voic
part
foun
that
the
he
expr
by v
free
surv
the
desi

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

GERMANY.

THE ANTI-JEWISH AGITATION.

THE question of the relation of the Jewish to the Christian population is rising into painful prominence in Germany and Russia. In the latter country there have been several violent outbreaks of popular hatred against the Jews, some of them attended by loss of life and great destruction of property. The same state of feeling exists in Germany, although there the outbreaks have not been so violent. The ferment going on in the public mind is very bitter, and it is not easy to see what it is all tending to. Within the last year this subject has very deeply engaged public attention, and has been keenly discussed in Church conferences and public assemblies of the people in various districts of the country as well as by the legislature. The German journals have fully reported the state of the public mind, and have dealt with the question from various points of view. Besides this there has been a constant succession of pamphlets representing various shades of opinion on the subject. Some reference to these will convey to our readers some idea of the actual state of things.

One* advocates legislation with the view of preventing an increase of the Jewish population, and ultimately of diminishing their number. As expressive of the general hatred toward all that is Jewish, many advocate the utter rejection of the Old Testament because of its historical connection with that people. Dr. Hemmer† of Berlin expresses bitter scorn toward the God of Abraham, and recommends a return to the old mythology. A writer,‡ pointing to the state of things in Austria, where it is alleged that the Government is under Jewish influence, and where almost the entire body of advocates are Jews, calls upon the people to refuse them places of power and trust. Another§ refers to the fact that in 1879, in Galicia, no fewer than 3164 estates were sold by public auction, and passed into the hands of Jews, to whom the owners of them were under pecuniary obligations. In Bukowina, in the same way, the half of all the property belongs to the Jews, and the director of the statistical bureau in Galicia is of opinion that in a very short time they will gain possession also of the other half. These facts are set forth in a way to arouse to greater intensity the feeling of hatred against the Jews.

The anti-Semitic petition presented to the German Government received 255,000 signatures, and may be regarded as giving expression to a very general feeling. Alarmed by this state of things, several of the rabbis have made their voices heard on behalf of their people. Dr. Landsberger|| earnestly calls on both parties to be at peace, but at the same time maintains that Judaism rests on a foundation of truth. Dr. Köhler,¶ of New York, takes up the view of Mommsen, that the Jew is a citizen of the great world, the leaven of cosmopolitanism among the nations, and that in order to the accomplishment of his cosmopolitan mission, he must hold fast to his Jewish nationality. The Jewish deputy Bamberger expresses the feeling of many of the Jews, and brings to view the hostile spirit by which they also are animated, when he demands that the State should allow free play to the forces that are contending with each other, so as to secure "the survival of the fittest." Professor Baumgarten** speaks strongly on the side of the Jews, and condemns the ideas of Stöcker regarding a Christian State. He designates a Christian State as "the abomination of abominations," and all who

* Wieninger, *Selbsthilfe gegen die fortschreitende Verjudung*. Vienna.

† *Juda u. d. deutsche Gesellschaft*. Berlin.

‡ *Wählet keinen Juden*. Berlin.

§ *Der neueste Raub am deutschen Nationalwohlstand*. Frankfurt.

|| *Wahrheit, Recht u. Friede*. Berlin.

¶ *Deutschland u. d. Juden*. New York.

** *Wider Herrn Hofprediger Stöcker: Christliche Stimme über die Judenfrage*. Berlin.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, July, 1881.]

aim at its destruction he salutes as friends. The Ober-Kirchenrath, he says, ought to proclaim a national fast on account of the anti-Semitic petition. There are pamphlets and articles in journals, not a few on the other side, insisting on the necessity of maintaining and extending the domain of Christianity in Germany, as the only solution of the Jewish question. An article in the *Allg. Cons. Monatsschrift* of May last, to which Dr. Messner* calls attention, is thus described by him :—"The author is certainly not prejudiced against the Jews. He perceives in the Jewish people noble and distinguished qualities, and complains that Germany has not acted worthily toward them. He also does justice to Talmudism, and shows that it has secured to the centre body of the Jews an intellectual training which has made them susceptible of any form of custom. But he also looks narrowly, and from an historical point of view, into the other side of the case, and shows that Pharisaism and the Talmud have so desolated and withered their heart and spirit, that the Jewish people are quite incapable of understanding Christian thoughts. Both of these influences have systematically shut them off from all other people, and filled them with scorn and hatred toward them, and most of all toward heretics or Christians. The contact of the Jews with every cultured historical nation brought, for the latter alone, however, an all-sided crisis in their material and intellectual life and condition. Therefore the nations did only what was right when they regarded the Jews amongst them as a separate and peculiar people, and they have suffered most severely when this has not been done. Spain is pointed to as furnishing an illustration of this.

"The conflict for the maintenance of their peculiarity is the deepest cause of the present movement against the Jews in Germany; but certainly the advancement of the Jews and their domination also exercise a most destructive influence over the principles, ideas, and facts out of which our present European condition has arisen; and this is always the case whenever the Jews interfere in the history of nations. Thus the author understands the 'modern Jewish question,' and in his views we entirely concur."

* *Neue Ev. K.-Zeitung*. 21st May, 1881.

CA

THE
task,
provi
as is
the u
prop
scar
tory,
scho
on t
on it
retai
degr
the
whic
tain
cern
of th
of m
guag
thro
stan
com
The
felic
con
mat
at
V